

CHURCH HISTORY



Published by
THE AMERICAN SOCIETY OF CHURCH HISTORY

THE AMERICAN SOCIETY OF CHURCH HISTORY

FOUNDED BY PHILIP SCHAFF, 1833; REORGANIZED, 1906; INCORPORATED BY ACT OF
THE LEGISLATURE OF NEW YORK, 1916

OFFICERS FOR 1938

REUBEN E. E. HARKNESS President
CHARLES LITTLE Vice-President
MATTHEW SPINKA Secretary
ROBERT HASTINGS NICHOLS Treasurer
ROBERT FORTENBAUGH Assistant Secretary

OTHER MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL

WILLIAM DAVID SCHIRMERHOFF	WILHELM PAUCK
WILLIAM WARREN SWEET	HERBERT WALLACE SCHNEIDER
CONRAD HENRY MOSHMAN	ROLAND H. BAINTON
FREDERICK WILLIAM LOUISCHER	F. W. BUCKLER
JOHN THOMAS McNEEL	E. R. HARDY, JR.

EDITORIAL BOARD OF CHURCH HISTORY

MATTHEW SPINKA, *Managing Editor*
ROBERT HASTINGS NICHOLS
REUBEN E. E. HARKNESS, *ex officio*

PUBLICATION OFFICE, BERNI, INDIANA

EXECUTIVE AND EDITORIAL OFFICE, CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

CHURCH HISTORY is a quarterly journal published in March, June, September, December by the American Society of Church History. The subscription price is Three Dollars per year. The price of single copies is seventy-five cents. To foreign countries, the postage of twenty-five cents a year should be added. Subscriptions should be sent to Professor Matthew Spinka, 5757 University Ave., Chicago, or to Professor Robert Hastings Nichols, 10 Nelson Street, Auburn, New York. Remittances should be made to the order of American Society of Church History.

All communications regarding contributions, book reviews, and all other matters of editorial nature should be sent to Professor Matthew Spinka, 5757 University Avenue, Chicago, Illinois.

Claims for missing numbers and changes of address should be addressed to Prof. R. H. Nichols, 10 Nelson St., Auburn, N. Y.

Entered as second-class matter March 9, 1934, at the post office at Berni, Ind., under the Act of March 3, 1879.

CHURCH HISTORY

EDITORIAL BOARD

MATTHEW SPINKA, *Managing Editor*

ROBERT HASTINGS NICHOLS

REUBEN E. E. HARKNESS, *ex officio*

VOL. VII

JUNE, 1938

No. 2

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PRESBYTERIAN ATTITUDES TOWARD SLAVERY <i>Irving Stoddard Kull</i>	101
THE CHURCH AND THE SOCIAL ORDER IN THE OLD SOUTH AS INTERPRETED BY JAMES H. THORN- WELL <i>H. Shelton Smith</i>	115
THE AMERICAN MISSIONARY SPIRIT, 1828-1835 <i>J. Orin Oliphant</i>	125
WALTER RAUSCHENBUSCH AND THE BROTHERHOOD OF THE KINGDOM <i>C. Howard Hopkins</i>	138
CONRAD GREBEL, THE FOUNDER OF SWISS ANABAPT- ISM <i>Harold S. Bender</i>	157
NEW DOCUMENTS ON EARLY PROTESTANT RATIONAL- ISM <i>Roland H. Bainton</i>	179
MINUTES OF THE FOURTEENTH SPRING MEETING OF THE SOCIETY AND THE COUNCIL, APRIL, 1938	188

CONTENTS

BOOK REVIEWS

194

- GOODSPEED, E. J.: *New Chapters in New Testament Study* Donald Wayne Riddle
- WAND, J. C.: *First Century Christianity* Henry J. Cadbury
- LOWE, H.: *The Contact of Pharisaism with Other Cultures* E. F. Scott
- OPPERMAN, C. J. A.: *The English Missionaries in Sweden and Finland* Conrad Bergendoff
- MCCANN, P.: *A Valiant Bishop Against A Ruthless King: The Life of St. John Fisher* Joseph Cullen Ayer
- HOLBORN, H.: *Ulrich Von Hutten and the German Reformation* Robert Hastings Nichols
- KRAHN, C.: *Menno Simons* Roland H. Bainton
- HIERONYMUS A FELLETTE: *De S. Laurentii a Brundusio O. M. Cap. activitate apostolica ac operibus testimoniorum Elenchus* J. M. Lenhart, O. M. Cap.
- MATHER, C.: *Manuductio ad Ministerium: Directions for a Candidate of the Ministry* J. Orin Oliphant
- PIETTE, MAXIMIN: *John Wesley in the Evolution of Protestantism* William W. Sweet
- LINCOLN, A.: *Some Political and Social Ideas of English Dissent, 1763-1800* M. M. Knappen
- WILLIAMS, D. J.: *One Hundred Years of Welsh Calvinistic Methodism in America* Guy S. Klett
- SWEET, W. W.: *Indiana Asbury-DePauw University, 1837-1937* A. W. Nagler
- GEISMAR, E.: *Lectures on the Religious Thought of Sören Kierkegaard* Conrad Henry Moehlman
- GARBER, P. N.: *John Carlisle Kilgo, President of Trinity College, 1894-1910* Miles Mark Fisher
- MYERS, A. J. W.: *Horace Bushnell and Religious Education* H. Shelton Smith
- THORP, M.: *Charles Kingsley, 1819-1875* T.S.K. Scott-Craig



gift
L. G. Vander Vliet
3-9-48

PRESBYTERIAN ATTITUDES TOWARD SLAVERY

IRVING STODDARD KULL

Rutgers University, New Brunswick, N. J.

Although for two and a half centuries of our American history slavery was a legal institution and for much of that time a significant factor in our life and although throughout that long period there were opponents to it, moral and religious opposition was not strong until a late date. Much of the opposition in the colonial period was from an economic point of view: the returns would not justify the institution; the initial cost of the slaves was great; their labor was unwillingly given; the system promoted the idleness of the rich and robbed the poor of opportunity and prevented the immigration of industrious laborers. Benjamin Franklin thought that slavery retarded population and industry, and Dr. Benjamin Rush observed that small farms with free labor returned greater profits than slave economy. Here there was no question as to whether slavery was morally right or wrong, only "did it pay?"¹ There was also, in this early period, opposition to slavery from a political point of view in that security was endangered. But in all the thirteen colonies slavery existed and everywhere respectable people owned slaves and clergymen of the major churches, if they had the price, owned them as well dressed clergymen to-day own automobiles. Here and there a lone voice was raised in opposition on moral or religious grounds, but only the Quakers, as a religious group, made slave-keeping a bar to fellowship. John Woolman, their anti-slavery apostle, made it his life work to go about the country and argue against slavery, because it was contrary to Christianity and because "liberty was the right of all men equally."²

The American Revolution gave rise to a premature anti-slavery movement and though reaction followed, the movement never died out. The conflict with England was productive of

1 Mary Stoughton Locke, *Anti-Slavery in America from the Introduction of African Slaves to the Prohibition of the Slave Trade (1619-1808)* (Boston, 1901), 9 and note, 20, 23, 58.

2 John Woolman, *Journal*, various editions, *passim*.

far-reaching moral and philosophical enthusiasm which embraced the black man as well as the white. Did not the great Declaration say that all men were created equal and that they were endowed with inalienable rights, and did not philosophers find these rights written in the laws of nature? Could white men then deny to black men what they were warring to secure for themselves? James Otis said, "The Colonists are by the law of nature born free, as indeed all men are, white or black."³ The law of nature was a benevolent doctrine. Five days before the battle of Lexington, the first anti-slavery society was founded in America,⁴ and before the Revolution had run its course, abolition had been written into law north of the Mason and Dixon line and great planters of the South were discussing the evils of slavery and looking to its abolition.

Those were easy days for the anti-slavery advocate, and then it was that the Presbyterian church took its first anti-slavery step though, as it turned out, a hesitating and cautious one. In 1774 the subject of slavery came before the Synod of New York and Philadelphia, at that time the supreme judicatory of the church, and "after much reasoning on the matter" a committee was appointed to bring in an overture, but such were the differences of opinion that the matter was postponed till the next meeting.⁵ In fact, though the matter came up again and again, it was not until 1787 that the church took a stand.

In that year an overture was brought before the synod which said:

The Creator of the world having made of one flesh all the children of men, it becomes them as members of one family, to consult and promote each other's happiness. It is more especially the duty of those who maintain the rights of humanity and who acknowledge and teach the obligations of Christianity, to use such means as are in their power to extend the blessings of equal freedom to every part of the human race.

From a full conviction of these truths, . . . *Overtured*, that the Synod of New York and Philadelphia recommend, in warmest terms, to every member of this body, and to all the Churches and families under their care, to do everything in their power consistent with the rights of civil

3 Locke, *op. cit.*, 49.

4 J. F. Jameson, *The American Revolution Considered as a Social Movement* (Princeton, 1926), 33.

5 *Records of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America Embracing the Minutes of the General Presbytery and General Synod 1706-1788 Together with an Index and the Minutes of the General Convention for Religious Liberty 1766-1775* (Philadelphia, 1904), 456, 458-9.

society, to promote the abolition of slavery, and the instruction of negroes, whether bond or free.⁶

The response to this overture, the first action of the church on slavery, was cautious and conservative. While it approved of the general principles in favor of universal liberty, the synod was mindful of the danger to the rest of the community in a too hasty abolition and recommended that slave owners in its communion "give their slaves such education as to prepare them for freedom" and then to facilitate their buying their liberty "at a moderate rate" that they might be brought into society with habits of industry. It finally recommended to their people "to use the most prudent measures, consistent with the interest and state of civil society in the counties where they live, to procure eventually the final abolition of slavery in America."⁷

Beyond reiteration of the formula of 1787 the Presbyterian church did not go until 1818, when it took its most advanced stand in opposition to slavery, beyond which it never went. It then stated its principles as follows: "We consider the voluntary enslaving of one portion of the human race by another, as a gross violation of the most precious and sacred rights of human nature; as utterly inconsistent with the law of God, which requires us to love our neighbors as ourselves, and as totally irreconcilable with the principles and spirit of the gospel of Christ which enjoin that all things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them." Such principles would seem to require vigorous action, but there followed no proposal that would loosen the bonds. The church said that while it was the duty of Christians to use their endeavors to correct the errors of former times, they should not act so speedily as to jeopardize the safety and happiness of the master and slave. The church sympathized with those portions of its body where the evils of slavery had been entailed upon them and where the number of slaves and their ignorance and vicious habits rendered their immediate emancipation dangerous, and it urged efforts towards abolition as speedily as compatible with public welfare. Moreover, after the injury brought upon the unhappy Africans by enslaving them, the church could not urge additional injury by emancipating them

⁶ *Ibid.*, 539.

⁷ *Ibid.*, 540.

so fast that they might destroy "themselves or others."⁸ Here, on the one side, was a vigorous enunciation of principles which could be carried out only with the abolition of slavery, on the other side, such concern with safety as to furnish slave-owners justification for continued slave-holding. Here was compromise between principles on one side and slavery entanglements on the other. Christianizing of the social order has never been easy.

The years between this action of 1818 and the Civil War are among the most extraordinary in American history, marked not only by new developments but by rapidity of development. There was change in our economic life, in social organization, and in our philosophies of life. Launching the industrial revolution, the East was puzzling over the implications of machines and factories and cities. The West gathering together its motley peoples that had crowded through the mountain passes and floated down its rivers was fitting the patterns of order to its vast domain and in the span of one man's life it made of a wilderness the major force in American politics, and sent Andrew Jackson to the presidency.

Life in the South was no less surging. The American Revolution had left the Southern plantation in a bad way. Depression was on the land and tobacco was entering upon a long stretch of low prices. It seemed to John Randolph that he would have to run away from his slaves to escape bankruptcy. But not for long. To the new lands of the Gulf, the South brought its old labor system and a new contraption for the ginning of cotton, the gift of a young Yale graduate. From Charleston on to Texas pushed the planter and in the Gulf states arose the Cotton Kingdom. In 1791 the total export of cotton was 200,000 pounds, in 1803, 40,000,000 pounds. The census of 1860 reveals a crop of 2,300,000,000 pounds which was three quarters of the world output.⁹ There was hardly a year when cotton did not more than equal in value all other American exports, at time doubling all others in value.¹⁰ Little

8 *Minutes of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America from Its Organization A. D. 1789 to 1820 Inclusive* (Philadelphia, 1847), 688-694.

9 Vernon Louis Parrington, *The Romantic Revolution in America 1800-1860* (New York, 1927), 62; U. B. Phillips, *American Negro Slavery* (New York, 1918), 211-212.

10 T. W. Van Metre, *Economic History of the United States* (New York, 1921), 365.

wonder that planters had given up running away from their slaves.

South, East, and West, each was fabricating its own economic life and making profitable adjustments, each with the other sections and all trying to live together under one political roof. On the economic side one factor in the situation was paramount. That was cotton. It was the great staple and it had a market; English factories and our own called for more and ever more. It made the planter a wealthy man but it also meant profits for everybody; it meant profits for the Western farmer who sold his corn and pork to the South and for the Eastern manufacturer who in turn could now sell to Western farmers as well as to cotton planters. Northern industry and capital profited enormously from Southern wealth. In addition to providing the South with manufactures and gathering the middleman's profits on its foreign importations, the North provided the South with its transportation, insurance and brokerage and was handsomely paid for its services. After the bills of business were paid, the planters spent their balance in the Northern hotels and watering places where they and their ladies crowded in the vacation seasons. In fact the South in spite of its wealth was debtor to the North, owing to Northern merchants at the outset of the Civil War close to \$300,000,000.¹¹ After all, the North seemed to be the chief beneficiary of the Cotton Kingdom and its slaves.¹²

Cotton was the magic that gave speed to America in this middle period. What was more natural than that cotton should be king? And so it was. For a generation the slave-owning planters ran the government. Congress they controlled with ease. Half of the seats in the Senate were filled from slave states. The Northern states possessed a majority of the seats in the lower house but the South could count on a majority of the votes because of Northern profits in the slave system. The presidency was filled by men of Southern choice and the Supreme Court squared its decisions with the interests of the cotton kingdom. As, since the Civil War, our government has been the instrument of the industrial magnate of the East, prior to the war, it was the instrument of the planter aristocracy.

¹¹ Harold Underwood Faulkner, *American Economic History* (New York and London, 1924), 381.

¹² Cf. T. P. Kettell, *Southern Wealth and Northern Profits* . . . (New York, 1860).

The concern of this study is with the attitudes of the Presbyterian church toward slavery during the political dominance of the Southern planter aristocracy. First, however, two developments need to be kept in mind. One, a new abolition movement, and the other the division of the church in 1837 into the so-called Old School and New School churches.

The new abolitionism stemmed in large measure from the religious revival under Charles G. Finney which rose to its height in 1830 and gave impetus and additional channels to an already large humanitarian movement.¹³ This especially affected the Presbyterian church, because the center of Finney's revival was the New School area in New York state from whence exponents of this abolitionism were shortly to bring agitation into the General Assembly of the church.

In the second place, to be kept in mind is the division of the church in 1837. For some years doctrinal differences had been dividing churchmen, the so-called New School, with New England and Congregational background, running after the softer Calvinism of New Haven, and the Old School, with Scotch-Irish heritage, holding fast to the good old doctrines. The revivalism of Finney was not calculated to ease matters inasmuch as Finney, following his conversion, came into the ministry from the practice of law without theological training. It seemed that New School men were more reckless than ever with true doctrine. They now added insult to injury by taking up the cause of immediate abolition and, keeping in mind that Presbyterians of the slave states were in the main Old School, the irritation was doubled.

Histories of the split of 1837 have been chiefly concerned with doctrinal matters and have considered such the cause of division.¹⁴ However, the anti-slaveryism of the New School men did not retard the split.

In 1835, Theodore Weld, Finney's number one convert, attended the General Assembly as a lobbyist for immediate emancipation,¹⁵ and reported later that "nearly one fourth part

13 Gilbert Hobbs Barnes, *The Antislavery Impulse 1830-1844* (New York, London, c. 1933).

14 Lewis Cheeseman, *Differences Between Old and New School Presbyterians* (Rochester, 1848); Zebulon Crocker, *The Catastrophe of the Presbyterian Church in 1837* (New Haven, 1837); James Wood, *Old and New Theology: or, The Doctrinal Differences which have Agitated and Divided the Presbyterian Church* (New and enlarged edition, Philadelphia, 1855).

15 "Immediate emancipation" was defined in the debate at Lane Seminary in 1834 as "gradual emancipation, immediately begun." Barnes, *op. cit.*, 66.

of the Assembly" followed him in his position.¹⁶ To one observer, it looked "as if the Presbyterian Church were becoming an Abolition Society."¹⁷ In the General Assembly of 1836, with a majority of the delegates New School men, twelve memorials were presented asking that body to take action against slavery¹⁸ and to an observer on that occasion it seemed as if slavery would divide that body,¹⁹ but for the time being the whole matter of slavery was postponed indefinitely by a vote of 154-87. It was not until the next General Assembly, with a majority of the delegates Old School men, that four of the erring New School synods were excinded and when the separation was complete some four-ninths of the Presbyterian clergy and laymen were in the New School church. Most of them were in the North although some were in the South. As for abolitionism there remained some anti-slavery men in the Old School.²⁰

The *Cincinnati Journal* said that the cause for excinding the four synods was their anti-slavery stand. This the *Princeton Review* denied with supporting evidence.²¹ The basic cause for the division was doctrine, although the abolitionism of the New School men no doubt hastened the breach,²² and in some Old School quarters there was rejoicing over the break.

For example, the Rev. Dr. Baxter, after returning to Virginia from the General Assembly of 1837, told a group of theological students that the one advantage of the excinding of the New School synods was that it would "put an end to the abolition question and disturbances in the Presbyterian Church."²³ Quite true, the Old School was no more disposed to tamper with the social order than with true doctrine. As expressed by a South Carolina presbytery, in October, 1836, "the church has no right to prescribe rules and dictate principles which can bind or effect the conscience in reference to slavery; and any such attempt would constitute ecclesiastical tyranny;

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, 94.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 94.

¹⁸ *Minutes*, General Assembly, 1836, 273.

¹⁹ Barnes, *op. cit.*, 95.

²⁰ The question of slavery in the Assembly of 1837 was laid on the table by a vote of 93 to 28. *Minutes*, 1837, 479.

²¹ *Princeton Review*, July, 1837 (vol. 9, no. 3), 479, 480.

²² Cf. William Warren Sweet, *Religion on the American Frontier, Vol. II, The Presbyterians 1783-1840, a Collection of Source Materials* (New York and London, 1936), 119.

²³ *New York Observer* (July 15, 1937), 110.

that slavery has existed from the days of those good old slaveholders and patriarchs, Abraham, Isaac and Jacob; that the existence of slavery is not opposed to the will of God, and who-soever has a conscience too tender to recognize this relation as lawful, is righteous overmuch, is wise above what is written, and has submitted his neck to the yoke of man, sacrificed his Christian liberty of conscience, and leaves the infallible word of God for the fancies and doctrines of men."²⁴

However, by 1845 the General Assembly of the Old School could no longer avoid the slavery question. In the preceding year the cotton magnates had won the presidential election in a contest in which, for the first time slavery was a clear cut issue, and in the same year, both the Methodist and Baptist churches had split over slavery. In 1845, anti-slavery men in the General Assembly now sought to commit it to the proposition that slavery was "a moral evil, a heinous sin in the sight of God, calculated to bring upon the Church the curse of God, and calling for the exercise of discipline in the case of those who persist in maintaining or justifying the relation of master to slaves."²⁵

This was an exceedingly strong anti-slavery proposal and could not have been assented to by the Southern members of the General Assembly. Whereas many could agree that slavery was an evil, they could not go so far as to declare it a sin. Sin was a transgression of the law of God which demanded of the church discipline. Assent to such a doctrine in that year would no doubt have split the Old School over the question of slavery into Northern and Southern branches. Though a majority of its presbyteries were in the North, the church conceded to the South and denied the proposition. It said that the church of Christ was a spiritual body and could not legislate where Christ had not. The question then was this: "Do the Scriptures teach that the holding of slaves is a sin, the renunciation of which should be a condition of church membership?" The Assembly said that "while declining to deny that there is evil connected with slavery" it could not denounce it as a sin. Then followed an argument from the New Testament. "The Assembly intend simply to say," quoting its words, "that since

²⁴ This was the Harmony Presbytery. Crocker, *op. cit.*, 64.

²⁵ Samuel J. Baird, *Assembly's Digest, A Collection of the Acts, Deliverances, and Testimonies of the Supreme Judicatory of the Presbyterian Church from its Origin in America to the Present Time* (Philadelphia, 1855), 823.

Christ and His inspired Apostles did not make the holding of slaves a bar to communion, we, as a court of Christ, have no authority to do so." The Apostles did no other than teach the gospel to masters and slaves. That is all the church should do.²⁶ Those were the days before Darwin when one could not aspire to be better than Christ or His apostles. Sin was defined in the word of God and not in the intuitions of men.²⁷

Here was a decidedly pro-slavery document, a victory for the South, acclaimed as such in the South, and condemned as such in the North. And although the Northerners were in the majority in the Assembly, this deliverance was adopted by a vote of 168 to 13.

The concluding victory of the pro-slavery forces in the Old School church came in 1859 when the General Assembly assumed control of the Northwestern Theological Seminary which was located at New Albany, Indiana, transferred it to Chicago, accepted an endowment gift of \$100,000 from Cyrus H. McCormick, and then, after removing the anti-slavery professors who occupied its chairs, appointed in their places a faculty eminently safe for the South. This is a tortuous story that has never been published. It can not be told here but I cite it as illustrating the completeness of pro-slavery and Southern domination in the Old School. The important positions in the Assembly in that year of 1859 were held by pro-slavery men. William L. Breckenridge of Kentucky was made moderator. Nathan C. Rice who was to be elected to the professorship of theology was chosen to deliver the opening sermon and was made chairman of the important committee on bills and overtures. Benjamin M. Palmer, great preacher of New Orleans, was made chairman of the committee on theological seminaries. It was Palmer who, a year later, said that "the Providential trust of the Southern people is to conserve and perpetuate the institution of domestic slavery as now existing." With these men was James Henry Thornwell as the ruling spirit. He was a professor in the Columbia Theological Seminary, in South Carolina, and one of the great comforts to the South.

In the mind of Thornwell the church was a society or organization which had a fixed and unalterable constitution

²⁶ Baird, *op. cit.*, 822-824.

²⁷ A. A. Hodge, *Life of Charles Hodge* (New York, c. 1880), 333.

in the inspired word of God. It did not derive its "authority and obligation from the consent of its members," nor were its doctrines, discipline, and order the "creatures of human will." In consequence, its sphere of activity was restricted to the Bible, not transcending the word of God.²⁸

The church was not "a moral institute of universal good, whose business is to wage war upon every form of human ill, whether social, civil, political, or moral, and to patronize every expedient which a romantic benevolence may suggest as likely to contribute to human comfort and to mitigate the inconsequences of life." The church had "no commission to construct society afresh." In consequence when the Bible did not declare slavery a sin, which it did not in Thornwell's mind, the church had no business to tamper with it.²⁹

The pro-slavery party had great reason to rejoice in this capture of the Northwestern Seminary. In the East it had long been secure in the Princeton Theological Seminary where Charles Hodge, the great theologian, dominated the scene to the satisfaction of the slavocracy.³⁰ Such was the Old School on the eve of the Civil War.

The New School Presbyterian church had a different history on the slavery question. Whereas the Old School Assembly came increasingly under the domination of the pro-slavery interests, the New School Assembly responded increasingly to the anti-slavery forces of the North.

In 1837, following the expelling of the New School synods, the Rev. Dr. Baxter of Virginia had said that he had "always had the impression that the abolition spirit must be principally in the New School, and that the good old Presbyterians . . . could not be carried away with that fanatical system."³¹ There was good basis for Dr. Baxter's opinion, for prior to 1837, in all of the four synods that were excised that year by the General Assembly, their synodical meetings had

28 William Sumner Jenkins, *Pro-Slavery Thought in the Old South* (Chapel Hill, N. C., 1935), 207, 208.

29 *Ibid.*, 208.

30 Charles Hodge, *A Commentary on the Epistle to the Ephesians* (New York, 1856); *Princeton Review* (Philadelphia, 1837-1865, begun in 1825 as the *Biblical Repertory* and, after various changes in name, became in 1837 the *Biblical Repertory and Princeton Review*, edited by Dr. Hodge and containing a number of articles by him on slavery; E. N. Elliott, *Cotton is King: and Pro-Slavery Argument* (Augusta, Georgia, 1860) for "The Bible Argument on Slavery" by Dr. Hodge, 841-877; A. A. Hodge, *op. cit.*

31 Quoted in the *New York Observer* (July 15, 1837), 110.

denounced slavery as "a sin against God and man."³² However, abolitionism was not the foundation of the New School as seen by the fact that by 1839 five Southern synods had gone over to it,³³ and by the fact that though slavery came up for discussion in practically every General Assembly, the sensibilities of the Southern members forced a temporizing note into the Assembly's pronouncements for some years to come.³⁴ In 1846 a stronger position was taken when the Assembly declared that "the system of slavery, as it exists in the United States, . . . is intrinsically an unrighteous and oppressive system, and is opposed to the prescriptions of the law of God, to the spirit and precepts of the gospel, and to the best interests of humanity." But a conciliatory note was struck when the Assembly added that it would "not undertake to determine the degree of moral turpitude on the part of individuals involved by it. . . . We cannot pronounce a judgment of general and promiscuous condemnation . . . which should exclude from the table of the Lord all who stand in the legal relation of master to slaves," and "we do at the same time condemn all divisive and schismatical measures tending to destroy the unity and disturb the peace of our churches."³⁵ After occupying the attention of the Assembly for twelve sessions, this pronouncement was adopted by a vote of 92 to 29. This is decidedly a more anti-slavery document than that adopted by the Old School in the preceding year but it illustrates beautifully the difficulty which even this liberal wing of the church had in pronouncing upon slavery.

This action was taken in 1846, the year the Southern picked president of the United States made war on Mexico. From that year on the sectional conflict grew sharper and anti-slavery moved onto the political stage, and from that date the New School Presbyterian church took a more and more advanced anti-slavery position.

Two protests were made against the Assembly's action

³² Crocker, *op. cit.*, 65, 66; Sweet, *op. cit.*, 118.

³³ Statistics of 1839 give 19 synods in the New School with 79 presbyteries and 1314 churches. The Southern synods were Missouri with 2 presbyteries and 39 churches, Mississippi with 2 presbyteries and 20 churches, Virginia with 3 presbyteries and 14 churches, Tennessee with 3 presbyteries and 46 churches, and South Carolina-Georgia with 1 presbytery and 8 churches. *Minutes of the General Assembly* (New School), (1839), 62 ff.

³⁴ See *Minutes of the Assembly* for 1839, 1840, and 1843.

³⁵ *Minutes of the Assembly* for 1846, quoted in Albert Barnes, *The Church and Slavery* (Philadelphia, 1857), 76-78.

of 1846. In one the protestants thought it "inexpedient that the General Assembly should take any action whatever on the subject of slavery" and contended that slavery as it existed in the Southern states is not forbidden by the laws of God and the principles of the gospel of Jesus Christ as revealed in his Holy Word. In the other, the single protestant pointed out that "some degree of moral turpitude attached to every one who holds a slave" and that therefore he should be disciplined.³⁶

In 1849 the General Assembly was satisfied to reaffirm its principles but in 1850 it took much more decided action in declaring that "the holding of our fellow-men in the condition of slavery, except in those cases where it is unavoidable, by the laws of the State, the obligations of guardianship, or the demands of humanity, is an offence in the proper import of that term . . . and should be regarded and treated in the same manner as other offences."³⁷ This designation of slave-holding as an "offence," in Presbyterianism called for discipline. However the "unavoidable" cases allowed basis enough for rationalizing a great deal of slaveholding and inasmuch as the individual church sessions and presbyteries were the courts of primary jurisdiction, antislavery men of the North could hardly expect action on the "offence."

In 1851 it seemed the "privilege and duty of the Church" to leave the whole subject where it was left in 1850. In 1853, with eleven memorials before it from the North praying for further action and asking for information regarding the extent of slave-holding in its churches, the General Assembly by a vote of 84 to 39 asked the Southern presbyteries to inform the next Assembly as to the numbers of slave-holders within their churches and the extent to which slaves were there held by "unavoidable necessity."³⁸ When 1854 brought only complaints in response, the Assembly, said Albert Barnes, "properly dropped the subject."³⁹ In 1855 a committee was appointed to report a year later on the constitutional power of the Assembly over the subject of slave-holding in the churches. This report gave little satisfaction to the anti-slavery men inasmuch as, outside an advisory function, the committee found no power to commence discipline with an individual offender.

36 Albert Barnes, *op. cit.*, 80.

37 *Ibid.*, 85.

38 *Ibid.*, 91-93.

39 *Ibid.*, 97, 98.

The year 1857 saw the culmination of the anti-slavery agitation of the New School church. The Assembly of that year was confronted with an official notice from the Presbytery of Lexington, South, that a number of ministers and ruling elders, as well as church members within it, held slaves "from principle" and "of choice," "believing it to be according to the Bible right" and that the presbytery intended to sustain them. The consequence was that the anti-slavery men pushed through the Assembly by a vote of 169 to 26 a condemnation of this position of the Lexington Presbytery and called upon it to rectify its position. The Southerners protested that this action was a virtual excising of the South.⁴⁰ Later that year, they met in Richmond, Virginia, and formed the United Synod of the Presbyterian Church.⁴¹ Thus the New School Presbyterian church split over the slavery question. When in 1861 the Old School split it was because of secession and war and not because of slavery.

In summary, the Presbyterian church in 1818 adopted with confidence strong anti-slavery principles based upon the gospel of Christ and the humane philosophy of the Revolution and set as an objective the abolition of slavery throughout Christendom. At the same time the church was not unaware of the complications of its social and economic environment. With time this environment brought the Presbyterian church more and more under its control. More and more as the cotton power dominated the economy and the government of the United States it brought the church under its sway so that in the South the church moved from a position of not only declaring the church slavery not a sin, or even an evil, but to one of pronouncing it a positive good; as Dr. Ogden of Columbia Seminary in South Carolina called it "*the only good thing* in the whole affair of negro existence in America," or as the Rev. J. C. Postell of South Carolina said, it was of "Divine appointment," "a merciful visitation." "It is the Lord's doing and merciful in our eyes."

In 1837 came the split into Old School and New School wings as a result of doctrinal divergence and incompatibility

⁴⁰ *Minutes*, (New School), 1857, 401-406.

⁴¹ Edward D. Morris, *The Presbyterian Church, New School 1837-1869* (Columbus, Ohio, 1905), 142. In 1858 figures showed that 6 synods with 21 presbyteries comprising 285 churches with 16,137 members had withdrawn from the New School.

of New England and Scotch-Irish temperaments plus a growing abolitionism in the New England element in the New York and Ohio synods. After that date the slave power moved into the sanctuary of the Old School and though its Northern members did not wax lyrical in defense of slavery they joined with their Southern brethren in deference to the Cotton Kingdom.

The New School, somewhat smaller than the Old, with a large proportion of its membership Northern,⁴² with an inheritance of Congregationalism and a more liberal theology, moved from the silence of 1837 to such condemnation of slavery and slave-holders that its membership in the slave states seceded. Such was the official course of the Presbyterian Church. Its larger and more orthodox branch bowed to the dominant economic and political power. Only the minority stood against the slavocracy. Christianizing the social order has never been easy.

42 In 1856 in a total of 1,677 New School churches, 301 were in slave states.

THE CHURCH AND THE SOCIAL ORDER IN THE OLD SOUTH AS INTERPRETED BY JAMES H. THORNWELL

H. SHELTON SMITH

Duke University, Durham, N. C.

The last generation of the *ante-bellum* South devoted its best thought to the integration of a plantation culture whose economic base was chattel slavery. Every aspect of its civilization had to make its peace with slavery or be rejected. Long before the guns fired on Fort Sumpter, southern civilization had wrought out an ideology that was as dogmatic as Marxism has ever dared to be. Those who rejected this ideology were promptly silenced or ushered into a cooler climate. The liberalism of an older revolutionary South had long ago been smothered in the atmosphere of cultural fascism.

The church, like all other bearers of culture, had to reckon with the South's "peculiar institution." In this process of reckoning, Dr. James H. Thornwell played a master rôle. What Calhoun was to political theory in this period Thornwell was to the social ethics of the church. Indeed, his contemporaries called him the "Calhoun of the Church."¹ Both were sons of South Carolina, the state that led in the secession movement. Both went North for their last period of academic life. Both were surprisingly alike in their passion for logical gymnastics. Both began their careers as devoted nationalists, and both died flaming sectionalists.

Not until he had graduated from college did Thornwell connect himself with the church, although he had given thought to the subject of religion. At one time in his college course, he flirted with Socinianism,² but he could not tolerate the rationalistic Deism of his president, Dr. Thomas Cooper. Apparently his own religious views were in flux until near his graduation. About this time, while browsing in a bookshop, his eyes fell upon a copy of the Westminster Confession of

¹ Vander Velde, L. G., *The Presbyterian Churches and the Federal Union* (Cambridge, 1932), 30.

² B. M. Palmer, "Life, Character, and Genius of the Late Reverend James H. Thornwell," *Southern Presbyterian Review*, XV (1862-63), 265.

Faith. A careful reading of this led him to embrace Presbyterianism unwaveringly for life. He was ordained to the ministry in 1835, but his pastorates were brief and intermittent. His chief service was to be in the field of education. After two highly successful periods of teaching at South Carolina College, he was chosen its sixth president in 1852. After three years, he voluntarily surrendered the presidency of the college to become professor of theology in Columbia Theological Seminary, where he spent the remainder of his life. Chosen a commissioner to the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church at the early age of twenty-four, he was elected moderator in 1847 at thirty-four. As a religious thinker, the South of his day had no greater. He was prominently involved in all the crucial events of his denomination. When, in 1861, the southern churches withdrew from the General Assembly, he became the leading voice in the creation of the Presbyterian Church of the Confederate States. It is not too much to say that his theological thought has dominated most of the history of Southern Presbyterianism. His conception of the relation of the church to society still controls the thinking of a large proportion of southern churchmen of all denominations.

Thornwell's conception of the relation of the church to the social order defined itself most sharply in reference to the controversial subject of slavery, a subject that steadily became more acute in both politics and religion. As early as 1847 he and his fellow ministers of the South Carolina Synod said: "Slavery is implicated in every fibre of Southern society; it is with us a vital question."³ The fact that slavery was woven into the entire web of contemporary culture implicated all institutions in its existence, the church no less than the state. Thornwell understood this, and he sought to contrive a theory of the church that would meet the demands of the political no less than the religious situation. He had always advocated the necessity of holding to the "spiritual" conception of the church. Accordingly, he held that temperance, education, and humanitarian projects were not properly functions of the church as a corporate body. With the issue of slavery growing, he now saw that unless the church did restrict itself to what he called "spiritual" matters, both the unity of the church and the unity of the nation would be shattered.⁴

³ Thornwell, *Works*, IV, 396.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 382; 394-395.

In his approach to a solution, Thornwell resorted to the medieval two-kingdom theory of the relation of church and state. "The provinces of the Church and State," he said, "are perfectly distinct, and the one has no right to usurp the jurisdiction of the other. The State is a natural institute, founded in the constitution of man as moral and social, and designed to realize the idea of justice. It is the society of rights. The Church is a supernatural institution, founded on the facts of redemption, and is designed to realize the idea of grace. It is the society of the redeemed. The State aims at social order; the Church at spiritual holiness. The State looks to the visible and outward; the Church is concerned for the invisible and inward. . . . They are as planets moving in different orbits."⁵

Making explicit the implications of this doctrine, he said: "It [the church] has no commission to construct society afresh, to adjust its elements in different proportions, to rearrange society, the distribution of its classes, or to change the form of its political constitutions. . . . it is not the distinctive province of the Church to build asylums for the needy or insane, to organize societies for the improvement of the penal code, or for the arresting of the progress of intemperance, gambling or lust."⁶ From this it might be inferred that Thornwell conceived such matters to be altogether beyond the province of religion, but this would be a mistake. Although the church limits its operations to "its own appropriate sphere," it nevertheless permeates the life of the individual in such fashion as to "react upon all the interests of man."⁷ Christian individuals may make changes in the common life, but it is not allowable for the church, as such, to do so. "The problems, which the anomalies of our fallen state are continually forcing on philanthropy, the Church has no right directly to solve."⁸

But even individuals, Thornwell held, must recognize that there are limits to social reconstruction. In his view, the Fall had infected our social order with maladjustments or imperfections from which it could not hope to escape within human history. Distinctions of rank, for example, may be, from the absolute standard, an evil, "but in our fallen world, an absolute equality would be an absolute stagnation of all enterprise and

⁵ *Ibid.*, 449.

⁶ *Works*, IV, 383.

⁷ *Ibid.*, 382.

⁸ *Ibid.*, 383.

industry."⁹ He looked with disfavor upon those rationalistic humanitarians who thought they could convert this world into the Kingdom of God. Perfection could be attained only beyond history, in heaven, in which state, he admitted, there would be neither slavery nor any other ailment of our disordered earth.¹⁰

The institution of slavery laid a heavy burden upon Thornwell's doctrine of the relation of church and state. As already stated, he held that church and state were as separate as the planets. And yet he could not relate slavery exclusively either to the church or to the state. It entailed the concern of both, the state in its political aspects and the church in its moral aspects. In taking this position, he found himself opposed to two types of extreme opinion. One extreme point of view was that slavery was exclusively a civil institution, and that the church had no jurisdiction in respect of it. "Though a civil and political institution," he said, "it [slavery] is the subject of moral duties; and the Church has a right to exact the faithful performance of these duties from all her members who are masters or slaves. Cruelty to a servant is as much the subject of ecclesiastical censure as cruelty to a wife. The Church must rebuke *all* sin in *all* the relations of life. The slave she must require to be faithful; the master, merciful and just."¹¹

The other extreme point of view against which he protested held that since slavery is a "natural evil," like poverty or disease, the church must seek to bring about its abolition. He rejected this proposition not only because he thought that it would involve the church in matters that were outside its proper sphere, but also because he thought that this course of action ran contrary to the teaching of the Bible.¹² To meet these two alleged false propositions, Thornwell brought into operation all his mental powers.

The thing that incensed him more than anything else was the assumption by critics of the South that slavery was, from the Christian point of view, a sin. When in 1847 the Presbyterian General Assemblies of Scotland and Ireland sent letters to the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in Amer-

9 Thornwell, "Slavery and the Religious Instruction of the Colored Population," *Southern Presbyterian Review*, IV (1850), 128.

10 Thornwell, "Slavery and the Religious Instruction of the Colored Population," *Southern Presbyterian Review*, IV (1850), 126-127.

11 *Works*, IV, 501.

12 *Ibid.*, 500.

ica implying that slavery was a sin, Thornwell was stirred to sharp rejoinder. After sarcastically reminding the churches of Scotland and Ireland that they had evils at home about which they might well busy themselves, he said: "These letters assume what never can be proved from the Word of God, nor the light of nature, that Slavery is essentially a sin."¹³

Upon the hypothesis that slavery is a sin, Thornwell himself readily admitted that the church would have to cast it off. But on what ground is one to determine whether or not slavery is a sin? "The Bible and the Bible alone," says Thornwell, "is her [the church's] rule of faith and practice. . . . Beyond the Bible she can never go, and apart from the Bible she can never speak."¹⁴ John Calvin never searched the Scriptures with more zeal than did Thornwell, for he was faced with a burning question. By 1851 he had his biblical verdict, a verdict that he resolutely clung to until his death in the midst of the war. "Certain it is," he said, "that no direct condemnation of slavery can anywhere be found in the Sacred Volume. . . . The master is nowhere rebuked as a monster of cruelty and tyranny, the slave nowhere exhibited as the object of peculiar compassion and sympathy. . . . We find masters exhorted in the same connection with husbands, parents, magistrates; slaves exhorted in the same connection with wives, children, and subjects. . . . The Scriptures not only fail to condemn slavery, they as distinctly sanction it as any other social condition of man. The Church was formally organized in the family of a slaveholder; the relation was divinely regulated among the chosen people of God; and the peculiar duties of the parties inculcated under the Christian economy. These are facts which cannot be denied. Our argument then is this: If the Church is bound to abide by the authority of the Bible, and that alone, she discharges her whole office in regard to slavery when she declares what the Bible teaches, and enforces its laws by her own peculiar sanctions. Where the Scriptures are silent, she must be silent too. . . . To this she is shut up by the nature of her Constitution."¹⁵ Thornwell went so far as to say that even if slavery should be adjudged undesirable from the point of view of economics, politics, or general policy, it could never

¹³ *Works*, IV, 500.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 384.

¹⁵ *Works*, IV, 386-387.

be considered, on the basis of the Bible, repugnant to the will of God.¹⁶

He was fully acquainted with all the extra-Biblical arguments that were used by the Abolitionists, such as those based upon the theory of natural rights, respect for personality, and the like. But he observed that whatever truth might be contained in these arguments, they did not negate the plain teaching of the Bible. He was certain that social radicals had formed their opinions in the first instance independently of the Bible, and then had tortured Scripture into support of their assumptions. "They seem much more like apologists for the defects and omissions of the Scriptures, than like humble inquirers sitting at the feet of Jesus to learn His will. They have settled it in their own minds that Slavery is a sin; then the Bible must condemn it, and they set to work to make out the case that the Bible has covertly and indirectly done what they feel it ought to have done."¹⁷ The more consistent Abolitionists, he says, "have not scrupled to reject these precepts, and to denounce the Book which enjoins them. They feel the incongruity betwixt their doctrines and these duties, and they do not hesitate to revile the Scriptures as the patron of tyranny and bondage."¹⁸

Radicals who rejected the Bible were, for Thornwell, not only enemies of right-ordered society, but were atheists in the sight of God. In one of his most dramatic utterances, he said: "The parties in this conflict are not merely Abolitionists and Slaveholders; they are Atheists, Socialists, Communists, Red Republicans, Jacobins on the one side, and the friends of order and regulated freedom on the other. In one word, the world is the battle ground, Christianity and Atheism the combatants, and the progress of humanity the stake."¹⁹

But if Thornwell fought the Abolitionists who would eliminate the institution of slavery altogether, he also fought the plantation capitalists and others of the South who neglected the moral duties of the slave-master relation. The church has no right to destroy the order of slavery, but it must seek to correct the evils which flow from its abuse.

By 1850 Thornwell had evolved what he called "the Chris-

16 *Ibid.*, 387.

17 *Works*, IV, 392.

18 *Ibid.*, 392.

19 *Ibid.*, 405-406.

tian Doctrine of Slavery."²⁰ In this doctrine he demanded that the slave be accorded certain rights. In the first place, the slave has a right to be regarded as the white man's brother. He scorned those who, for whatever reason, sought to reduce the Negro to the status of the brute. "Science, falsely so called, may attempt to exclude him from the brotherhood of humanity. Men may be seeking eminence and distinction by arguments which link him with the brute; but the instinctive impulses of our nature, combined with the plainest declarations of the Word of God, lead us to recognize in his form and lineaments, in his moral, religious and intellectual nature, the same humanity in which we glory as the image of God. We are not ashamed to call him our *brother*."²¹

On numerous occasions Thornwell urged the church to concern itself more actively with the implications of this right, and seek the Christian conversion and Christian instruction of the slave population. He sharply castigated as infidels those who dared to neglect the salvation of the Negro on the false assumption that he was without a soul. "The meanest slave," he urged, "has in him a soul of priceless value."²² "The injustice of denying to them food and raiment and shelter, against which the law effectually guards, is nothing to the injustice of defrauding them of that bread which cometh from heaven."²³

Unfortunately, of course, the conception of what religion is to do for the slave is pathetically narrow. "Our design in giving them the Gospel," says Thornwell, "is not to civilize them, not to change their social condition, not to exalt them into citizens or freemen; it is to save them."²⁴ To masters who feared that religion might put ideas of freedom into the heads of their servants, Thornwell said: "None need be afraid of His [Jesus'] lessons. . . . He was no stirrer up of strife, no mover of sedition. . . . Is anything to be apprehended from the instructions of Him in whose textbook it is recorded: 'Let as many servants as are under the yoke, count their masters worthy of all honor'? Christian knowledge inculcates contentment with our lot, and, in bringing before us the tremendous realities of eternity, renders us comparatively indifferent to the incon-

²⁰ *Ibid.*, 398-436.

²¹ *Works*, IV, 403.

²² *Ibid.*, 433.

²³ *Ibid.*, 433.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, 433.

veniences and hardships of time. It subdues those passions and prejudices from which all danger to the social economy springs."²⁵ Marxians would have more than a little ground here for saying that such a gospel serves as an opiate in the mind of those in bondage.

In the second place, the slave is not the mere creature of the master. The master has a right to his labor, but not to an unlimited control over his person.²⁶ Among the remaining rights of the slave are the right of protection against injury and cruelty; the right to acquire knowledge, and especially religious knowledge; the right to protection against sexual exploitation; the right to the enjoyment of family life.²⁷

All of these rights, however, must be granted in light of the fact that the Negro is a slave, not a freeman. The right of the slave, in other words, is a relative right. The Golden Rule, for example, is equally applicable only between master and master or between slave and slave. As between a slave and his master, the Golden Rule is met when the slave is accorded such treatment as one in his station has a right to expect. To those who held that the application of the Golden Rule would lead to the emancipation of the slave, Thornwell said: "The same principle which would make the master emancipate his servant on the ground of benevolence would make the rich man share his estates with his poor neighbors."²⁸ And this, he warned, "would make havoc of all the institutions of civilized society."

On the brink of the Civil War, Thornwell indulged in a bit of prophecy concerning free labor that has had an uncanny fulfilment in the twentieth century. Observing the rising tide of unrest among free workers of the industrial areas of Europe and the United States, he said:

Where labor is free, and the laborer not a part of the capital of the country, there are two causes constantly at work, which, in the excessive contrasts they produce, must end in agrarian revolutions and intolerable distress. The first is the tendency of capital to accumulate. Where it does not include the laborer as a part, it will employ only that labor which yields the largest returns. It looks to itself, and not to the interest of the laborer. The other is the tendency of population to out-

²⁵ *Works*, IV, 434.

²⁶ Thornwell, "The State of the Country," *Southern Presbyterian Review*, XIII (1860-1861), 874.

²⁷ *Works* IV, 432.

²⁸ *Works*, IV, 391.

strip the demands of employment. The multiplication of laborers not only reduces wages to the lowest point, but leaves multitudes wholly unemployed. While the capitalist is accumulating his hoards, rolling in affluence and splendor, thousands that would work if they had the opportunity are doomed to perish of hunger. The most astonishing contrasts of riches and poverty are constantly increasing. Society is divided between princes and beggars. If labor is left free, how is this condition of things to be obviated? The government must either make provision to support people in idleness; or it must arrest the law of population and keep them from being born; or it must organize labor. Human beings cannot be expected to starve. There is a point at which they will rise in desperation against a social order which dooms them to nakedness and famine, whilst their lordly neighbor is clothed in purple and fine linen and faring sumptuously every day. They will scorn the logic which makes it their duty to perish in the midst of plenty. Bread they must have, and bread they will have, though all the distinctions of property have to be abolished to provide it. The government, therefore, must support them, or an agrarian revolution is inevitable. But shall it support them in idleness? Will the poor, who have to work for their living, consent to see others, as stout and able as themselves, clothed like the lilies of the field while they toil not, neither do they spin? Will not this be to give a premium to idleness? The government, then, must find them employment; but how shall this be done? On what principle shall labor be organized so as to make it certain that the laborer shall never be without employment, and employment adequate for his support? The only way in which it can be done, as a permanent arrangement, is by converting the laborer into capital; that is, by giving the employer a right of property in the labor of the employed; in other words, slavery. The master must always find work for his slave, as well as food and raiment. The capital of the country, under this system, must always feed and clothe the country. There can be no pauperism, and no temptations to agrarianism. That non-slaveholding states will eventually have to organize labor, and introduce something so like to slavery that it will be impossible to discriminate between them, or else to suffer from the most violent and disastrous insurrections against the system which creates and perpetuates their misery, seems to be as certain as the tendencies in the laws of capital and population to produce the extremes of poverty and wealth.²⁹

Comparing the social situation in the South with that in the North, he says: "We do not envy them their social condition. . . . As long as the demand for labor transcends the supply, all is well; capital and labor are mutual friends, and the country grows in wealth with mushroom rapidity. But when it is no longer capital asking for labor, but labor asking for capital; when it is no longer work seeking men, but men seeking work—then the tables are turned, and unemployed labor and selfish capital stand face to face in deadly hostility."³⁰

²⁹ *Works* IV, 539-541.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, 541.

If Thornwell's analysis of the process of capitalistic industrialism is decidedly Marxian, his proposed method of preserving the privileged against social catastrophe is startlingly fascistic. As already pointed out, Thornwell himself believed in a social order as definitely class-patterned as that of feudalism. The more democratic ideals of the liberal era of the Old South, he, like Calhoun, unhesitatingly rejected. When he said, "We cherish the institution [slavery], not from avarice, but from principle,"³¹ he reflects the same sort of illusion that characterizes the holders of social power in every period of crisis.

When the cultural crisis of the Old South approached the catastrophic stage, Thornwell flung to the winds his own theory of the separate provinces of church and state, and heatedly discussed politics from the pulpit.³² When the matter of political secession was being discussed, his own Synod promptly assured those in political power that the churches would sanction this sort of action. And when his own state, South Carolina, met in extraordinary session to consider withdrawal from the Union, Thornwell was there to lead the opening prayer.

31 Thornwell, "National Sins—A Fast Day Sermon," *Southern Presbyterian Review*, XIII (1860-1861), 679.

32 *Ibid.*, 649-688.

THE AMERICAN MISSIONARY SPIRIT, 1828-1835

J. ORIN OLIPHANT

Bucknell University, Lewisburg, Pa.

Within the years indicated in the title of this paper, missionary activity in the United States came to be permeated by a spirit of enterprise that was truly remarkable. The enthusiastic outbursts of those years, presently to be noticed, were in truth novel expressions of faith grown militant, but they were not uncharacteristic of the time. Rapid change within a generation had made thoughtful Americans keenly aware of the fact that they were living in a new age, an age distinguished, among other things, for Christian benevolence.¹ As the democratization of American life proceeded, latent energies were released and the mobilization of such energies in associations for the promotion of change was revealing to the common folk of America a new and effective way of social action and was implanting in their consciousness a belief in the idea of progress. By the decade of the 1820's Americans generally were coming to believe that it was possible by united effort to achieve emancipation for the more fortunate many and amelioration of the lot of the less fortunate few. The multiplication of associations revealed an eager striving to attain these aims.² In the realm of religious activity the urge to accomplishment took the form of united endeavor for the conversion of the world.³ Many events within our period con-

¹ See especially an editorial, "Aspect of the Times," in the *American Sunday School Magazine* (Feb. 1827), IV, 34-35.

² See the observations of J. Walker, in an article entitled "Associations for Benevolent Purposes," in the *Christian Examiner* (July and Aug., 1825), II, 241-252, and an article by William Ellery Channing, entitled "Associations," *ibid.* (Sept., 1829), VII, 105-140.

³ World conversion as an object of missionary endeavor was a sentiment that pervaded both British and American missionary literature for many years before 1835. As typical examples, see: *The Panoplist*, n. s., (July, 1812), V, 91; Church Missionary Society, *Proceedings . . . 1819-1820* (London, 1820), p. 220; Gordon Hall and Samuel Newell, *The Conversion of the World . . .* 2d ed. (Andover, 1818); a resolution adopted by the Methodist Missionary Society of the New England Conference, in the *Missionary Herald* (July, 1826), XXII, 224; American Education Society, *Seventeenth Annual Report of the Directors* (Boston, 1833), p. 49; and a statement of the secretaries of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, in the *Missionary Herald* (March, 1833), XXIX, 108.

verged to induce the belief that by the intelligent application of human means so great and so desirable a goal might be attained within a time short enough to encourage men and women then living to bend every effort to its accomplishment. Facilities of transportation and of communication had improved and were improving; association as a method of social action had been tested and found not wanting. Moreover, to those who perceived the hand of God in history the great advancements and upheavals of the time appeared as clear interpositions of divine providence opening the way for the dissemination of the gospel throughout the world.⁴ And lastly, an awakening American consciousness and a maturing pride in American growth and achievement were uniting to persuade Christian philanthropists and patriots of America that God was raising up in that era of high destiny the great western republic to play a significant rôle in the conversion of the world to Christ.⁵ The exuberant spirit of that age of confidence and of abounding energy this study will endeavor in part to illustrate.

Since the illustrations that are about to be offered are derived in large part from the activities of societies that are not considered missionary by narrow definition, it is fitting that the conception of missionary organization and the modern missionary movement should be defined at the outset. The term "missionary organization" is used to designate all those societies, specialized and unspecialized, which sprang up in great profusion both in Europe and in America during the late years of the eighteenth and the early decades of the nine-

4 A very clear statement of this point of view is found in the *Sixteenth Annual Report of the American Bible Society, 1832*, in the following words: "But what more than all marks the present period, in relation to the Bible, is the wide and numerous doors which divine Providence is opening for its reception in the unevangelized parts of the earth." American Bible Society, *Annual Reports . . .* [reprints] (New York, 1838), I, 643. See also the resolution adopted by this society in 1831. *Ibid.*, p. 550. For a British expression of this point of view, see the *Boston Recorder and Religious Telegraph*, April 4, 1828, quoting the *London Missionary Register*.

5 See, as examples, A. B. S., *Annual Reports*, I, 427, and the anonymous article, "Means Employed by This Country for Promoting the Highest Interests of Mankind," in the *Quarterly Christian Spectator* (March, 1834), VI, 36-53. This state of mind was doubtless strengthened by the flattering observations of certain foreigners, especially Englishmen. For example, the Rev. John Hartley, an English missionary, in a letter from Syra to the Rev. Josiah Brewer, dated July 2, 1828, spoke as follows: ". . . Amidst all the confusion, tyranny, darkness and vice of so many other countries, I often contemplate the condition of the United States of America, with sincere gratitude to God. Notwithstanding all your defects, God has certainly set you as a city on a hill. Your institutions, both political and religious, are an example to the world. . . ." *Boston Recorder and Religious Telegraph*, Dec. 25, 1828.

teenth centuries, and which had for their object the diffusion of the gospel. Apart from the societies definitely called missionary, those that most obviously fall within the limits of this definition are the Bible societies, the Sunday School unions, the tract societies, and the education societies. From the Protestant standpoint all such societies had important work to do in the propagation of gospel truth. The missionary societies proper selected missionaries and supported them on their respective fields of labor; the Bible societies upheld their hands, distributing the Scriptures at home and providing money in aid of Bible translations and for the printing of the Bible in foreign tongues; the Sunday School unions organized the youth of the land, carried to them the message of the gospel, and thus broadened the base of the missionary structure; the tract societies, interested no less than other missionary agencies in the diffusion of the gospel, put into the hands of those who could read a literature of salvation; and the education societies, concentrating their attention on the training of poor and pious youth for the gospel ministry, prepared men without whom the gospel could not be effectively preached either on home or on foreign fields. Such organizations, then, supported by widely dispersed auxiliaries and not infrequently guided in their operations by interlocking directorates, constituted the framework of the missionary enterprise. And the sum of their activities was the modern missionary movement.⁶ The fact that men came to speak of the home missionary movement and of the foreign missionary movement is not important; such terms merely reflected specialization of effort, the different phases of the enterprise they designated finding unity in the common aim of converting the world to Christ.

The period selected for treatment likewise calls for a particular word of comment. The dates are only approximate; they might be altered without causing a serious inconvenience. Yet the eight years chosen do have a peculiar significance because of what lies back of them, of what lies beyond them, and, finally, because they mark an era of culmination.

The thirty years of American missionary history prior to 1828 comprise a more or less distinctive period, but a period

⁶ An excellent contemporaneous statement showing the interrelationship of all such societies is reprinted from the *Twenty-First Report* of the Anglican Church Missionary Society in the *Providence Rhode Island Religious Intelligencer*, March 1, 1822.

which, nevertheless, was vitally affected by the same forces that were transforming American life in its other phases. Missionary organizations, for example, kept step with the trend toward nationalization. The numerous small societies for the diffusion of the gospel⁷ that arose near the beginning of that period, formed to no slight extent in imitation of greater British societies,⁸ were, during the later years of the period, coming to be supplanted by national institutions. Local effort was giving way to national endeavor. Of this tendency illustrations abound. The decade beginning in 1810 saw the rise of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, the American Education Society, and the American Bible Society. The next decade witnessed the formation of the American Sunday School Union, the rise of the American Tract Society, and the emergence of the American Home Missionary Society. The very names of these societies suggest the spirit of nationalism. A similar tendency characterized the efforts of certain denominations whose missionary societies in that period acquired nation-wide ramifications. Of such there come to mind the American Baptist Foreign Mission Society, organized in 1814; the American Methodist Missionary Society, formed in 1819; and the Domestic and Foreign Missionary Society of the Protestant Episcopal Church, instituted in 1820. The growth of missionary organization, however, illustrated but one tendency of the age; for the passing years brought the art of religious propaganda to a high state of development, and propaganda helped to make the modern missionary movement a popular movement. Missionary sermons abounded, missionary tracts were widely distributed, the annual reports of missionary societies were spread abroad, and a significant religious journalism, comprising both magazines and newspapers,⁹ arose. Press and pulpit worked together to make the people mission-

7 O. W. Elsbee, *The Rise of the Missionary Spirit in America, 1790-1815* (Williamsport, Penna., 1928), chap. 3.

8 The following British societies exerted great influence in America: the Particular Baptist Society for Propagating the Gospel Among the Heathen (1792), the London Missionary Society (1795), the Church Missionary Society (1799), the Religious Tract Society of London (1799), and the British and Foreign Bible Society (1804).

9 After 1815, religious newspapers sprang up rapidly in the United States, the *Christian Watchman* and the *New York Observer* being two important examples. Religious magazines began to flourish in America at an even earlier date. For the titles of some of the earliest of these, see Elsbee, *op. cit.*, pp. 155-156. See also an editorial, "The Periodical Press," in the *American Sunday School Magazine* (May, 1827), IV, 132-133.

ary minded. But they worked not alone. The monthly concert of prayer was a reminder to thousands that the success of the missionary movement was not to be achieved by the employment of human means only. Widely used in the beginning as an institution for the promotion of the missionary cause in general, the monthly concert in time became particularized. Special concerts came to be held in behalf of particular phases of missionary endeavor. The concert of prayer for Sunday Schools is but a single illustration of several uses to which the practice of concerted prayer was put.¹⁰ Accordingly, as missionary organization widened in scope, and as missionary propaganda pervaded the thought of all classes of American society, men, women, and children in increasing numbers were drawn into the movement. Both rich and poor brought their contributions to the cause. In brief, the movement in America to diffuse the gospel of Christ clearly reflected, especially in the decade of the 1820's, the spirit of democracy as well as that of nationalism. By the end of that decade it had evolved an organization and had generated an enthusiasm which, in conjunction, were capable of producing vigorous responses to heroic suggestions.

Just beyond the year 1835 may be discerned important developments suggestive of changing times. Especially significant in the latter half of the 1830's was the growing spirit of division. Sectarian differences, for example, were emphasized by Baptist disapproval of the policies of the American Bible Society and by the formation by the Baptists in 1836-37 of the rival American and Foreign Bible Society,¹¹ as well as by the splitting in 1837 of the Presbyterian denomination into the Old School and the New School. Furthermore, in 1837 came the panic, and the several years of economic depression consequent thereon gave pause to ambitious programs of expansion. With these later trends this study has no concern.

10 On the concert of prayer in general, see Elsbree, *op. cit.*, pp. 135-136; London *Evangelical Magazine* (May, 1795), III, 198-202; *Missionary Herald* (Feb., 1833), XXIX, 76-77. For special applications of the concert, including the application to the Sunday School movement, see *Sunday-School Journal*, June 19, 1833; *Christian Watchman*, May 26, 1832; *Christian Index*, December 29, 1832; American Sunday School Union, *Second Report* (Philadelphia, 1826), p. 15.

11 Henry Otis Dwight, *The Centennial History of the American Bible Society* (New York, 1916), pp. 139-143; *Proceedings of the Bible Convention, Which Met in Philadelphia, April 26-29, 1837, Together with the Report of the Board of Managers of the American and Foreign Bible Society, Embracing the Period of its Provisional Organization* (New York, 1837).

Between the years 1828 and 1835 lies a distinct culmination of American missionary effort. The work of organization¹² went on, but no new principle was evolved; propaganda continued to do its work, perhaps more intensively than ever before. But it was by neither of these outward evidences of activity that that brief period was distinguished. What lends in retrospect peculiar interest to those eight years is a series of emotional explosions that launched evangelistic drives for the conquest of particular areas. By systematic advances the world was to be converted, and the exigencies of the time could brook no delay. So, at least, thought many an American Christian of Andrew Jackson's day. Accordingly, to some of the characteristic expressions of missionary zeal of that period we now turn.

As early as 1825 the American Bible Society took official notice of the determination of the Bible Society of Monroe County, New York, to supply every family in that county with a Bible;¹³ and in 1826 it observed with satisfaction that that society had accomplished its purpose.¹⁴ Here was a plan of procedure that promised much.¹⁵ It was widely imitated and soon was enlarged in scope.¹⁶ In 1828 the American Bible Society recorded several instances of plans being set on foot by Bible societies to furnish the Scriptures within a limited

12 The Western Foreign Missionary Society was organized by the Synod of Pittsburgh in 1831, the American Baptist Home Mission Society was formed in 1832, and the organization of the Domestic and Foreign Missionary Society of the Protestant Episcopal Church was perfected in 1835. *Missionary Herald* (Aug., 1834), XXX, 315; *Proceedings of the Convention Held in the City of New York, on the 27th of April, 1832, for the Formation of the American Baptist Home Mission Society*, . . . (New York, 1832), pp. 3-5; Samuel Wilberforce, *A History of the Protestant Episcopal Church in America* (London, 1844), p. 367.

13 A. B. S., *Annual Reports*, I, 307.

14 *Ibid.*, p. 341.

15 In a story relating briefly the history of the adoption of the resolution by the Bible Society of Monroe County and telling of the efforts made to carry it into effect, the *New York Observer* declared: "Here is an example of Christian energy and liberality worthy of universal imitation. . . . Why cannot their example be followed by every county in the state, and by every state in the union? How animating would be the spectacle, if this whole nation would rise in Christian majesty, and resolve that *there shall no longer be a family in America destitute of the Bible*. Is it too much to hope that the example of the citizens of Monroe will lead in the end to this glorious result?" Quoted by the *Boston Recorder and Religious Telegraph*, April 2, 1825.

16 *Missionary Herald* (Dec., 1827), XXIII, 394; *ibid.* (Jan., 1828), XXIV, 25. The Philadelphia Bible Society resolved on Sept. 17, 1827, to supply with Bibles the destitute in the state of Pennsylvania within three years. *Boston Recorder and Religious Telegraph*, Dec. 25, 1828; *Religious Farmer* (Milton, Penna., Dec. 25, 1828), II, 3. For numerous instances of local Bible drives, see the *Boston Recorder and Religious Telegraph*, May 23, June 6-13, Nov. 7, 1828.

term to all the families destitute of them within whole states.¹⁷ Further instances of county and of state-wide programs of Bible distribution were recorded by that society in its report for 1829,¹⁸ and at its annual meeting in that year it adopted with great enthusiasm a resolution committing itself to a nation-wide drive. The resolution reads as follows:

That this society, with a humble reliance upon divine aid, will endeavour to supply all the destitute families of the United States with the Holy Scriptures, that may be willing to purchase or receive them, within the space of two years, provided sufficient means be furnished by its auxiliaries and benevolent individuals, in season, to enable its Board of Managers to carry this resolution into effect.¹⁹

That this resolution touched a popular chord is revealed by the increased receipts and expenditures of the American Bible Society between 1829 and 1831, and by the enlarged issues of its Bibles and Testaments during those years. From less than \$76,000 in 1828, its receipts rose to more than \$170,000 in 1830; from somewhat more than \$83,000 in 1828, its expenditures rose to more than \$166,000 in 1830; and of the 1,326,698 books reported in 1831 as the grand total issued by the society since its formation in 1816, more than 680,000 had been issued since 1828.²⁰ At the close of the two-year drive the managers announced, with regret, that the goal set by the resolution of 1829 had not been completely attained, yet they did not despair of soon bringing the work to "a happy and triumphant conclusion."²¹ In truth, the society looked beyond this goal. At its annual meeting in 1833 it voiced by resolution²² its approval of the work of re-supply that had been undertaken by auxiliaries in Maryland, Ohio, and New York, and at the annual meeting in 1834 it passed the following comprehensive resolution:

That in the work of re-supplying with the Scriptures the destitute

17 A. B. S., *Annual Reports*, I, 407-415.

18 *Ibid.*, pp. 452-456, 471.

19 *Address of the Board of Managers of the American Bible Society to the Friends of the Bible of Every Religious Denomination, on the Subject of the Resolution for Supplying all the Destitute Families in the United States with the Bible in the Course of two Years* (New York, 1829), p. 2. A suggestion that such a resolution be adopted was made to the Board of Managers of the American Bible Society by the auxiliary society of Washington County, New York. A. B. S., *Annual Reports*, I, 458.

20 A. B. S., *Annual Reports*, I, 499; A. B. S., *Fortieth Annual Report* (New York, 1856), p. 172.

21 A. B. S., *Annual Reports*, I, 563-564.

22 *Ibid.*, p. 653.

families in our older states, in keeping up a supply in our new settlements, in furnishing them to our seamen and boatmen, to our army and navy, to hospitals and prisons, and to the numerous emigrants who are continually landing on our shores, the Auxiliary Societies and all friends of the Bible have motives to vigorous and unremitted exertions.²³

While the American Bible Society was thus directing its attention both to Americans and to prospective Americans in various walks of life, it was not unmindful of the need of Bible distribution in lands beyond the seas. As early as 1825 it had made a small grant to American missionaries in Ceylon, and by the year 1829 it was eagerly scanning the horizon for openings abroad.²⁴ During the next two years, however, attention was naturally concentrated upon the home field; but from 1831 onward for a few years the subject of foreign distribution was, in the language of the annual report for 1833, "one of thrilling interest."²⁵ At its annual meeting in 1831 it appeared to the society that the "civil commotions" witnessed in several parts of the earth were indications that God was preparing the way for "the dissemination of his word throughout the world."²⁶ In 1832 the call was urgent for contributions to promote Scripture circulation wherever American missionaries had gone, and, according to official report, the one sentiment that seemed to pervade the annual meeting in that year was that the time had come to set about supplying the whole world with Bibles.²⁷ A coming event was thus casting its shadow before.

A series of resolutions, adopted by the American Bible Society at its annual meeting in 1833, authorized and requested the board of managers to enter into a correspondence with Bible societies abroad, such correspondence to be particularly concerned with the expediency "of resolving, in reliance upon the blessing of God, to attempt the supply of the Bible, within a *definite period*, to all the inhabitants of the earth accessible to Bible agents, and who may be willing to receive, and able to read that sacred book."²⁸ It was the thought of some who urged the passage of such resolutions that the work might be accomplished within a period of twenty years.²⁹ But it fell out

²³ *Ibid.*, p. 707.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 442, 474 *et seq.*

²⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 680.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 550.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 608, 633, 639.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 654. This subject is treated by Dwight, *op. cit.*, chap. xv.

²⁹ A. B. S., *Annual Reports*, I, 835. Also, see the letter from the Rev. William S. Plumer to the Board of Managers of the American Bible Society, dated at Petersburg, Va., Dec. 30, 1834. *Ibid.*, p. 761.

that the British and Foreign Bible Society and the French and Foreign Bible Society were unwilling to commit themselves to so great a project calling for completion within a definite time;³⁰ wherefore, though the annual appropriation of the American Bible Society for foreign distribution, as reported in 1835 and again in 1836, exceeded \$35,000,³¹ the proposed drive to furnish Bibles to the whole world within a specified number of years was allowed to fade from view.

Enthusiasm for Bible distribution was, however, but a single manifestation of the evangelistic fervor of the years under review. A desire to enlarge the effort of the American Sunday School Union expressed itself on May 20-21, 1828, at special meetings³² of delegates to the fourth anniversary of the union, and also at a subsequent meeting, on May 26, of those delegates and other persons in Philadelphia. At the last-named meeting the following resolution was adopted:

That the American Sunday School Union ought to take immediate measures to establish, or cause, or procure to be established, Sabbath schools in every place in the United States and Territories, where there is a sufficient population.³³

Two years elapsed, however, before the union launched a drive to achieve within a limited time a goal of national significance.³⁴ At the annual meeting in 1830, upon motion of the Rev. Thomas McAuley, of Philadelphia, seconded by the Rev. Lyman Beecher, of Massachusetts, it was resolved:

That the American Sunday School Union, in reliance upon divine aid, will, within two years, establish a Sunday school in every destitute place where it is practicable, throughout the Valley of the Mississippi.³⁵

Within a few weeks thereafter meetings held in Philadelphia and New York voiced enthusiastic approval of this resolution and subscribed generous sums to promote the object thereof; and from other parts of the nation contributions were sent to the Valley Fund of the American Sunday School Union,

30 *Ibid.*, p. 726.

31 *Ibid.*, pp. 820, 875.

32 American Sunday School Union, *Fourth Report* (Philadelphia, 1828), pp. 15-17.

33 *Ibid.*, pp. 18-19.

34 It is probable that local Sunday School drives preceded the first national effort. It is reported, for example, that the Maryland Sunday School Union pledged itself, in April, 1828, "to establish a S. School in every neighborhood within 2 years." *Religious Farmer* (Jan. 27, 1829), II, 44.

35 A. S. S. U., *Sixth Report* (Philadelphia, 1830), p. 4. On the history of this resolution and the response to its adoption, see the *American Sunday-School Teachers' Magazine* (1830), VII, 217-223, 281-284, and *passim*.

the total to March 1, 1832, being \$60,714.60.³⁶ With evidence before it of substantial progress toward the realization of this aim, the annual meeting in 1832 pledged the union to sustain this enterprise until its final accomplishment.³⁷

The success of the Valley drive led to the launching in 1833 of another such project. At the annual meeting in that year there was passed unanimously the following resolution:

That the American Sunday School Union will endeavour, in reliance upon the aid and blessing of Almighty God, to plant, and for five years sustain, Sabbath schools in every neighborhood (where such schools may be desired by the people, and where in other respects it may be practicable) within the bounds of the States of Maryland, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, the District of Columbia, and the Territory of Florida.³⁸

Thus to the Valley drive, which was extended beyond the two years first contemplated, was added the Southern drive; and within a year following the adoption of the resolution relating to the South the contributions to the Southern Fund totaled nearly \$11,000.³⁹

Far-reaching as these two projects were, the enthusiasm of the supporters of the American Sunday School Union was not yet exhausted. Before the end of the year 1833 the board of managers was giving thought to calls for assistance from foreign lands, and to the annual meeting in May, 1834, the board reported that it had adopted the following resolution:

That some suitable agency be employed for raising \$12,000, to be appropriated by the Board of Managers of the American Sunday School Union, from time to time, to the supply of such missionary stations throughout the world as are sustained by American churches, with copies of our publications and the means of translating and printing them.⁴⁰

This resolution the union cordially approved,⁴¹ and by February 28, 1835, the contributions to the Foreign Fund totalled slightly more than \$1,500.⁴²

36 A. S. S. U., *Sixth Report*, pp. 5-8; *American Baptist Magazine* (Dec., 1831), XI, 380; *Quarterly Register of the American Education Society* (Nov., 1830), III, 139. The managers of the American Bible Society showed their approval of this undertaking by voting, in April, 1831, a grant to the American Sunday School Union of 20,000 Testaments for gratuitous distribution. A. B. S., *Annual Reports*, I, 559.

37 A. S. S. U., *Eighth Annual Report* (Philadelphia, 1832), p. 6.

38 A. S. S. U., *Ninth Annual Report* (Philadelphia, 1833), p. vi.

39 A. S. S. U., *Tenth Annual Report* (Philadelphia, 1834), p. 29.

40 *Ibid.*, p. 19.

41 *Ibid.*, pp. 4-5.

42 A. S. S. U., *Eleventh Annual Report* (Philadelphia, 1835), p. 35.

Paralleling the projects just described were similar projects for the distribution of religious tracts. In March, 1829, the New York City Tract Society put into effect the plan of giving a tract to every family in that city that was willing to receive it.⁴³ From this beginning the plan of systematic tract distribution spread rapidly, receiving in May of that year the endorsement of the American Tract Society.⁴⁴ During the years under review the American Tract Society greatly enlarged its operations, giving special attention to the wants of the Mississippi Valley.⁴⁵ Until 1833 its efforts were principally directed to the home field, the spirit in which it faced this task of spiritual reclamation being reflected in a resolution adopted on May 9, 1832, as follows:

That in view of the spiritual wants of the United States, and of the agency this nation may exert in the conversion of the world, this Society, with the blessing of God and the co-operation of the Christian community, will proceed immediately to the work of supplying systematically the entire destitute population of our own country with tracts, accompanied by the prayers and labors of faithful distributors.⁴⁶

Two years later the zeal for tract distribution in the United States expressed itself in a resolution pledging the society, "with the least possible delay," to put one or more of the society's bound volumes in every home where objection was not offered within the states of Maryland, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, and the Territory of Florida.⁴⁷ The resemblance of this proposed Southern drive to that of the American Sunday School Union is obvious. But the plans of the American Tract Society for domestic distribu-

43 New York City Tract Society, *Seventh Annual Report* (New York, 1834), p. 10. This plan was apparently foreshadowed by a resolution of the Philadelphia City Tract Society, adopted several months earlier, to "proceed without delay, to place within the reach of every family in this City and Suburbs some judicious Tract, whose object shall be to promote the sanctification of the Sabbath." *Boston Recorder and Religious Telegraph*, Aug. 29, 1828. Also, in April, 1828, the executive committee of the Pennsylvania Branch of the American Tract Society resolved to form a tract society in every township and congregation in both Pennsylvania and Delaware before Jan. 1, 1830. *Ibid.*, Sept. 19, 1828. See also the *Worcester Massachusetts Yeoman*, May 3, 1828, quoting from the *New York Observer*.

44 American Tract Society, *Fourth Annual Report* (New York, 1829), p. 4; *Missionary Herald* (March, 1830), XXVI, 88-89. For reports of monthly distributions of tracts, see the *Religious Farmer* (Sept. 8 and Nov. 17, 1829), II, 290, 379.

45 A. T. S., *Sixth Annual Report* (New York, 1831), p. 20.

46 A. T. S., *Seventh Annual Report* (New York, 1832), p. 4.

47 A. T. S., *Ninth Annual Report* (New York, 1834), p. 3.

tion were not yet exhausted. Witness the following resolution, passed at the annual meeting in 1835:

That, in accordance with suggestions of Auxiliary Societies, Public Meetings, and respected individuals in various parts of the country, this Society will endeavour, as soon as practicable, to supply with its *Standard Evangelical Volumes* the entire accessible population of the United States.⁴⁸

In the meantime the American Tract Society had not been wholly inattentive to the foreign field. In 1828 it reported an appropriation of \$300 for foreign operations, but not until the year 1832 did it report an annual appropriation for foreign distribution as large as \$5,000. But thereafter the appropriations for this phase of its work mounted rapidly, rising to \$10,000 in 1833, to \$20,000 in 1834, and to \$30,000 in 1835.⁴⁹ The mood for expansion and the driving spirit were pervading this realm of evangelistic endeavor no less than the realms of Bible distribution and Sunday School extension.⁵⁰ In all these fields of missionary effort we see abundant illustrations of what William Ellery Channing, in 1841, called a "commanding characteristic" of the age, viz., "the tendency in all its movements to expansion, to diffusion, to universality."⁵¹

With further illustrations of the American missionary spirit during those years we need not much concern ourselves. The trend of the time is now easy to see. Whether we look at the activities of interdenominational societies or at those of societies strictly denominational, we may perceive the same tendency at work. Everywhere men and women, buoyed up by a great hope, were mapping areas to be won in a short time for the kingdom of Christ and were eagerly striving to do their part to furnish means for the speedy conversion of the world. Given such a crusading spirit, we are prepared to understand a common sentiment pervading in those years the writings of all the Protestant denominations in America, whether such writings took the form of sermons, of annual reports of societies, or of magazine or newspaper articles. Given such a will to speedy accomplishment, we do not wonder at the rapid expansion of existing missionary establishments

48 A. T. S., *Tenth Annual Report* (New York, 1835), p. 5.

49 A. T. S., *Twelfth Annual Report* (New York, 1837), p. 13.

50 A resolution passed by the American Tract Society in 1835 asserted "That, with the blessing of God, this Society will endeavor to meet ALL providential openings for Tract distribution in *Foreign and Pagan Lands*." A. T. S., *Tenth Annual Report* (New York, 1835), p. 6.

51 William Ellery Channing, *Complete Works* (London, n. d.), p. 132.

or at the founding of new ones. We read with interest, but without astonishment, that the prudential committee of the American Board resolved in January, 1833, to send out within a year forty-nine missionaries,⁵² and that one year later it purposed to send out, before the end of a twelvemonth, sixty-four missionaries.⁵³ We are likewise prepared to understand such otherwise startling undertakings as the Methodist mission to the Oregon Indians in 1834 and the Baptist mission to France in the same year.⁵⁴ And lastly, in the desire to effect the speedy conversion of the world, a desire re-enforced and sharpened by the patriotic consideration of making the West safe for the East, we discern the dominant motives underlying the drives of the different Protestant denominations in America in the early 1830's to erect in the Valley of the Mississippi substantial bulwarks against infidelity and popery.

⁵² *Missionary Herald* (March, 1833), XXIX, 109.

⁵³ *Ibid.*, (Jan. 1834), XXX, 37.

⁵⁴ Cornelius J. Brosnan, *Jason Lee, Prophet of the New Orgeon* (New York, 1932), chap. I; William Gammell, *A History of American Baptist Missions . . .* (Boston, 1854), chap. XX.

WALTER RAUSCHENBUSCH AND THE BROTHERHOOD OF THE KINGDOM

C. HOWARD HOPKINS

Mount Hermon School, Mount Hermon, Mass.

The Brotherhood of the Kingdom was organized in December, 1892, by a small group of converts to the ideal of the kingdom of God on earth who, not unmindful of the examples of St. Francis and of the Society of Jesus, planned to reestablish the idea of the kingdom "in the thought of the church and to assist in its practical realization in the world." The year 1892 had witnessed a rising crescendo of social turbulence and political unrest throughout America. In the midwest the populist revolt was growing, while industrial warfare had broken out in the violent Homestead strike at the Carnegie steel plants. Jacob Riis had opened wide the festering tenements of the great cities in his revelation of *How the Other Half Lives*, while in intellectual circles the younger economists were rebelling against the tenets of the Manchester school. William Jennings Bryan's campaign for free silver was only four years away, and the Spanish-American War but six years in the future. Into such an atmosphere of storm and stress was born the Brotherhood of the Kingdom, dedicated to the realization of a spiritual ideal in the social order.

The roots of the social gospel movement, of which the Brotherhood was an integral part, sank deep into the early years of the nineteenth century, where they found strong nourishment in the radicalisms of Channing, the ethical impulses of evangelicalism, and the liberal views of Bushnell. But it was not until American protestantism was released from its preoccupation with the slavery issue that it could turn its attention to the ethical aspects of the new capitalistic civilization that was rapidly transforming the agricultural United States of Jefferson and Jackson into a nation of swarming cities. While those few clergymen who turned critical eyes upon the customs of the Gilded Age were but lone voices for the most part entirely ignored, the leaven of the new religious

social ideal began to take effect during the 1880's with the result that by 1890 various organizations dedicated to its propagation were springing into being here and there.

It has frequently occurred throughout the history of the church that small groups of disciples upon whom a new light has broken have banded together for the purpose of deepening their common understanding of the truth as it has been revealed to them, and to lend mutual strength for the spread of the new ideal. Such were the motives that led to the formation of the Brotherhood of the Kingdom, for the origins of which we must push back behind the date of 1892 into a deep friendship formed among three young clergymen of New York City in 1887. These men were Nathaniel Schmidt, minister to a Swedish Baptist congregation, Leighton Williams, who was forsaking the practice of the law to follow his father in the pulpit of Amity Baptist Church in West Fifty-fourth street, and Walter Rauschenbusch, pastor of the Second German Baptist Church. As Williams described it later, this acquaintance "rapidly grew into warm friendship and close association, cemented by a close similarity of ideas and regular weekly meetings. Our theological views were much the same and we were still more united in our social opinions."¹

Influenced by a paper written by Williams' father, the Rev. William R. Williams, the group pondered the formation of a modern "Society of Jesus." It was not long before Schmidt removed from New York, but the discussions were carried on by correspondence until the notion emerged with some clarity that there should be formed "a band of men voluntarily associating themselves, with a devotion as great as that of the Jesuits, but with clearer and juster opinions and greater freedom for individual action, who should be in a truer and higher sense a Society of Jesus, and who, without subscription to any creed, should endeavor to realize the ethical and spiritual principles of Jesus, both in their individual and

¹ Leighton Williams, *The Brotherhood of the Kingdom and its Work*, Brotherhood Leaflet No. 10 (reprinted from the *Proceedings* of the Congress of Religions at Omaha, October, 1897, 291-303) 1-2. This pamphlet is almost the sole source of information concerning the early years of the Brotherhood.

Materials on the Brotherhood of the Kingdom are somewhat rare. With the exception of *The Kingdom*, for which see Note 2, below, the best collections known to the writer are those of the Yale University Library and of the Ambrose Swasey Library of the Colgate-Rochester Divinity School, Rochester, New York. The New York Public Library and the American Baptist Historical Society of Chester, Pennsylvania, have many useful items.

social aspects, in their own lives and work, both individually and in cooperation with each other."²

Thus the matter rested for a time, until the group made the acquaintance of the Rev. Samuel Zane Batten of Philadelphia, who was later to become Professor of Social Science in Des Moines College and Social Service Secretary of the Northern Baptist Convention. As Williams spoke of it later, Batten "had been led to dwell much upon the teaching of Jesus regarding the kingdom, and suggested the formation of an organization that should be devoted to the study and realization of that idea." The Brotherhood of the Kingdom grew directly out of this proposal. Following several informal gatherings, the first of which was in Philadelphia in May, 1892, in connection with meetings of the Baptist missionary societies, the fellowship was formally organized in Philadelphia in December of that year.

Shortly afterward plans were made for a series of essays dealing with the idea of the kingdom, and it was agreed that the writers would meet at the Williams summer home at Marlborough, New York, in August, 1893, to compare their papers. This gathering of less than a dozen men was the first of twenty annual conferences of the Brotherhood of the Kingdom, all but one of which met on the Williams' hilltop above the Hudson, where limitless panoramas of river, hills, and woods afforded appropriate setting for reflection and inspiration. The Williams home, bearing the Welsh name *Plas Llecheiddior*, itself had long been a place of intimate friendship. When Walter Rauschenbusch visited it in 1890, he had written in the family Visitors' Book, "Only an afternoon and an evening, yet enough talk to turn over the world and enough love to make any heart happy."³

A local newspaper described the group that met in this almost sacred spot as composed of a number of Baptist clergymen "who have organized for the study of Christianity in its social aspects, for the promulgation of more just views of the Kingdom of God, and the application of the principles of the

² Williams, *op. cit.*, 3.

³ The writer is deeply indebted to Mrs. Leighton Williams of Marlborough, New York, for her generosity in making the Visitor's Book and other materials available to him, as well as for her interested co-operation and personal reminiscences concerning the membership and meetings of the Brotherhood—without both of which a complete picture would have been impossible.

Gospel to the social and industrial systems of the world." The essays read during these first days of fellowship were as follows:

- The Kingdom of God, by Rev. George Dana Boardman of Philadelphia.
- The Social Ideals of the Hebrew Theocracy, by Professor Nathaniel Schmidt of Colgate University.
- The Programme of the Kingdom, by Rev. Samuel Zane Batten.
- The Present King, by Professor William Newton Clarke of Hamilton Theological Seminary, Hamilton, New York.
- Two Equal Commandments, by Rev. H. H. Peabody of Rome, N. Y.
- The Relation of State, Church, and Kingdom, by Rev. Leighton Williams.
- The Brother in the Kingdom, by Rev. S. B. Meeser of Paterson, New Jersey.
- The Ethics of Jesus, by Rev. Walter Rauschenbusch.
- Church Unity and the Kingdom, by Rev. R. G. Boville of Hamilton, Ontario.

Instead of publishing their papers in book form as had been planned, certain conference addresses were later selected from time to time and printed as pamphlets, although none of these from the first conference were preserved. Most of the published essays were by Batten, Williams, and Rauschenbusch, who were the real leaders of the group through the years.

The statement "Spirit and Aims of the Brotherhood" that was adopted as the basis of organization on August 11, 1893, remained the constitution of the fellowship throughout its life, with the exception of slight modifications and additions in 1913 and 1915:

Spirit and Aims of the Brotherhood.

I. Organization. The Spirit of God is moving men in our generation toward a better understanding of the idea of the Kingdom of God on earth. Obeying the thought of our Master, and trusting in the power and guidance of the Spirit, we form ourselves into a Brotherhood of the Kingdom, in order to re-establish this idea in the thought of the church, and to assist in its practical realization in the world.

.

VII. Aims. The aims of the Brotherhood shall be carried into effect by the following means:

1. Every member shall by personal life exemplify obedience to the ethics of Jesus.
2. Every member shall propagate the thoughts of Jesus to the limits of his or her ability, in private conversation, by correspondence, and through pulpit, platform and press.

3. Every member shall lay stress on the social aims of Christianity, and shall endeavor to make Christ's teaching concerning wealth operative in the church.

4. On the other hand, each member shall take pains to keep in contact with the common people, and to infuse the religious spirit into the efforts for social amelioration.

5. The members shall seek to strengthen the bond of Brotherhood by frequent meetings for prayer and discussion, by correspondence, exchange of articles written, etc.

6. Regular reports shall be made of the work done by members.

7. The members shall seek to procure for one another opportunities for public propaganda.

8. If necessary, they shall give their support to one another in the public defense of the truth, and shall jealously guard the freedom of discussion for any man who is impelled by love of the truth, to utter his thoughts.⁴

This meeting of 1893 proved "so helpful and inspiring" that the group planned it as an annual gathering, widening the invitation in subsequent years. But before the friends departed from the Williams home, they subscribed their signatures to William Newton Clarke's entry in the family Visitors' Book:

"On this hill of God, in this consecrated house of God, we have met, enjoying the hospitality of God, and have spent these days in hopeful conference concerning God's kingdom. We here gratefully record our names, in testimony of our sense of our Father's presence, and in gladness that we are permitted to undertake the work of his household."

A year later, Clarke wrote in the Visitors' Book: "Once again the Brotherhood of the Kingdom, larger than a year ago and not less brotherly, has held its sessions on this consecrated hill;" and thirty-one persons signed their names. Forty-five signatures recorded the third meeting, in 1895, a gathering, "like the first and the second,—full of the unity of God's children, and warm with the presence of the One Spirit." For twenty years the Brotherhood continued to bring "the problems of the world" to this hill of consecration, where it considered them "in the spirit of faith and hope and love."

As the fellowship expanded new names appeared in its programs and in the Visitors' Book: William Howe Tolman, Milton S. Littlefield, Mitchell Bronk, Samuel Sears Merriman, Carl A. Daniel, F. C. A. Jones, Ernest Howard Crosby, F. W. C. Meyer, E. T. Root, Josiah Strong, Elias B. Sanford, George

⁴ This statement was frequently printed in Brotherhood literature, notably the *Reports* of the annual conferences.

H. Stroebel, Henry D. Lloyd, Clinton Rogers Woodruff, O. P. Gifford, Norman Fox, Louise Seymour Houghton, J. Winthrop Hegeman, Rudolph M. Binder, John H. Strong, Mornay Williams, and many others—with the result that the group soon lost its distinctly Baptist character. Women were admitted equally with men, a point on which the Brotherhood prided itself.

A typical conference day began with a quiet hour for prayer at seven. The regular public business session commenced at nine, when papers were read and discussed, the discussion being one of the most stimulating features of the meetings. The afternoons were likewise given to addresses and the exchange of ideas and opinions, neighbors and friends being invited in. When the weather permitted, the group met outdoors under the great trees surrounding the house, although the gatherings soon became so large that a tent was used to house them until the Amity Chapel was removed from New York in 1906 and set up near the Williams home. One meeting during each conference was given to the local community, with which the Brotherhood maintained the most cordial relations. The day was ended with a twilight service, held outdoors in the quiet August evening.

The Brotherhood's interests were about equally divided between social, ethical, and theological concerns. We have seen that the papers read at the first meeting were mostly occupied with the kingdom idea. While this interest was predominant in the earlier conferences, during its life the Brotherhood discussed practically every significant social problem that was arousing popular interest in those days. The land question and the single tax, retail trade, politics, socialism, labor, the home, corporations, direct legislation, and the municipal problem were all dealt with. On a few occasions the Brotherhood acted in a corporate way to protest specific wrongs or to challenge the churches with their social duties. The conference of 1897 addressed a resolution of sympathy to the striking coal miners. We have neither the call nor the information to sit in judgment on present conditions, this statement read, but "we hold this to be self-evident, that men are entitled to a fair living wage, and it seems to be generally conceded that the miners have been pressed down beyond the level of decency and humanity." Such things concern us all, and we

add our voice to the universal protest, holding especially that "the tendency to give capital a first lien on the proceeds of industry" is unethical. "A fair wage to the worker should come first," the resolution concluded, "and interest and dividends second, for life is more than property."⁵ An outstandingly important theme was that of Christian union. The social teachings of the Bible, the lives of great reformers and of Christian saints were studied and discussed, notably the seventh Earl of Shaftesbury and St. Francis of Assisi. Louise Seymour Houghton, translator of Sabatier's *Life of St. Francis*, became an enthusiastic member of the Brotherhood, and even built a summer home at Marlborough.

The fellowship's wide range of interests was well exemplified in the program for the conference of 1898, at which three series of papers were presented. The first of these, dealing with various aspects of liberty, analyzed political, industrial, and social liberty; the second group included sketches of four social prophets: Lammenais, Tolstoi, Mazzini, and Wycliffe; the third series was on Biblical topics, presenting in turn "The New Testament's Line of Approach to Social Ethics," "The Social Ideas of Paul," and "The Prophetic Office of the Pulpit." Other papers given at this conference were: "The Prophets of Israel as Social Leaders," "The Rural Population and the Social Movement," trade unions in New York, the social work of the church, a review of Sidney and Beatrice Webb's *Industrial Democracy*, and "The Basileia and the Ecclesia."

But all these interests were viewed in the light of the religious ideal of the kingdom of God. It cannot be too forcibly pointed out that the Brotherhood of the Kingdom, like the widespread social gospel movement of which it was a vital part, was fundamentally religious. The first principle upon which the fellowship had been founded was, as Williams wrote, that of discipleship to Jesus rather than loyalty to a creed. The second basic idea was that of brotherhood rather than a hard and fast organization. But the third, and by far the most important principle was the kingdom idea itself. This was at once a theological and a social ideal, a theme for study, and a focus for worship, as we have seen. The conception of the kingdom is "the most splendid ideal that has ever enriched human thought and inspired human effort," declared Samuel

5 *Report of the fifth conference, etc. (1897)*, 36.

Zane Batten at the Baptist Congress of 1894. The hold of the kingdom ideal upon these men was amply stated by Rauschenbusch in a glowing passage in one of his books:

In the Alps I have seen the summit of some great mountain come out of the clouds in the early morn and stand revealed in blazing purity. Its foot was still swathed in drifting mist, but I knew the mountain was there and my soul rejoiced in it. So Christ's conception of the Kingdom of God came to me as a new revelation. Here was the idea and purpose that had dominated the mind of the Master himself. All his teachings center about it. His life was given to it. His death was suffered for it. When a man has once seen that in the Gospels, he can never unsee it again.⁶

But before we can understand the conception of the kingdom as the members of the Brotherhood believed in it, we must turn aside to a brief examination of the intellectual climate of opinion in which it grew. The last decade of the nineteenth century saw the full acceptance of the Darwinian theory of evolution by progressive American theologians. While this marked the victory of liberalism in a battle that had raged for years, its significance for the social gospel lay in other than the controversial aspects of evolutionary thought. The impact of evolution upon religion strengthened the growth of at least three ideas important to the developing social gospel. These were the immanence of God, the organic character of nature and of human life, and the presence of the kingdom of heaven on earth.⁷ While none of these conceptions was unique or even new—the idea of the immanence of God going back at least to Spinoza—their acceptance by Protestant leaders and subsequent adoption into the historic faith marked Christianity's acclimatization into the modern world with its vast historical perspectives and its hearty belief in progress.

The doctrine of the immanence of God proposed the divine presence working out its purposes in the world of nature and hence in human society. "The Infinite God is infinitely at work in every man and in every age," said a speaker at the second Brotherhood conference. The doctrine of immanence likewise established Christianity as a natural religion rather than a supernatural or unscientific one. And the universal presence of the divine in humanity tended to abolish the distinction that had grown up between the sacred and the secular.

⁶ Walter Rauschenbusch, *Christianizing the Social Order* (New York, 1912), 93.

⁷ For a contemporary statement of these ideas, see Washington Gladden, *Ruling Ideas of the Present Age* (Boston and New York, 1895).

The second of these "ruling ideas," as Washington Gladden called them, was the belief in an organic, or, as Rauschenbusch preferred to say, a solidaristic society. This view, derived both from evolution and from sociology, provided at once a rational basis for brotherhood. In a solidaristic society indwelt by the Divine Spirit, all, sharing the universal Fatherhood, would be knit together in unity, rather than separated as single grains of sand, as the older individualistic theories had inferred. The conception of social salvation naturally followed upon this set of ideas, for it was realized that the life of the individual was incorporated in that of the social order.

The effect of these beliefs was perhaps best epitomized in the conception of the kingdom of God on earth. Freed of its traditional catastrophic setting and its background of demonism, as Walter Rauschenbusch commented later, the kingdom was now at home in the naturalistic atmosphere of the modern world. "Evolution," said Rauschenbusch, "has prepared us for understanding the idea of a Reign of God toward which all creation is moving." "Translate the evolutionary theories into religious faith," he continued, "and you have the doctrine of the Kingdom."⁸ While the kingdom idea was not unique to the Brotherhood—being widely held at the time—the Marlborough conferences explored it with great care. Against this background of popularly accepted ideas we may examine their findings.

In Brotherhood Leaflet No. 4, *The Kingdom of God*, Rauschenbusch pointed out what the kingdom is not. The term is used in five senses, he wrote, all of which are inadequate. There is "the blessed life after death—heaven," the mystical inner life of the spirit, the church, the millennial reign of Christ, and the missionary enterprise,—each of which widely held ideas errs "by defect:"

The Kingdom of God is larger than anything contained in any one of these ideas. It stands for the sum of all divine and righteous forces on earth. It embraces all pure aspirations God-ward, and all true hopes for the perfection of life. It is a synthesis combining all the conceptions mentioned above, and if we could combine them in such a synthesis, it would prove to be like some chemical compounds, more powerful than the sum of all its parts.⁹

⁸ Rauschenbusch, *op. cit.*, 90.

⁹ Rauschenbusch, *The Kingdom of God*, Brotherhood Leaflet No. 4 (reprinted from the *City Vigilant*, May, 1894) 4-5.

Turning to the positive aspects of the Brotherhood's thought concerning the kingdom, we find agreement upon its Scriptural foundation, both in the Old and the New Testaments. Samuel Zane Batten, to whom it will be recalled that the Brotherhood was originally indebted for the kingdom idea, dwelt upon this at length in an address at the Baptist Congress of 1894, that was subsequently printed as a Brotherhood leaflet. Batten asserted that in the Old Testament the goal of Jehovah's purpose was "the establishment in the earth of a Kingdom of righteousness and peace." Moving on to the Gospels, Batten held that the kingdom was "the very center and circumference" of the teaching of Jesus: "He ever thought and spoke in the categories of the Kingdom. The nature of the Kingdom, the conditions of entrance, the laws for its members, make up the substance of his teaching. In the Sermon on the Mount we have the King's ideals for the new society." Almost without exception, continued Batten, Jesus' parables set forth some aspects of the kingdom—its nature, conditions, rewards or retributions. Jesus said little about the future world, or the rescue of men from the pains of hell. With him the great duty of life was not preparation for quitting life. "Salvation is something to be realized here and now, for the whole of man, body, mind and spirit"—a sentence that was not only a summary of this view of the teaching of Jesus but an admirable statement of the concept of social salvation. Batten also found the kingdom the one theme of Paul's preaching and the underlying meaning of the Apocalypse. The full force of the evolutionary ideas we have just examined came into view in Batten's summary of his Scriptural study:

The Kingdom of God is the reign of God in and over men; it is manifested and illustrated in the life of the Son of Man; a long period will intervene between its inception and its full consummation; it is subject to the law of growth and development; the powers that make for the Kingdom are now the permanent and resident forces in our humanity; it finds its full consummation in a renewed and transformed humanity here and hereafter.¹⁰

Other members of the fellowship agreed in this interpretation. In an early tract entitled *The Brotherhood of the Kingdom*,

¹⁰ Samuel Zane Batten, "What is 'The Kingdom of God'?"

Proceedings of the twelfth annual session of the Baptist Congress for the Discussion of Current Questions (Detroit, Nov. 13-15, 1894, New York, 1895), 122-133; quotation p. 126.

Rauschenbusch said that the idea of the kingdom is the key to the teachings and work of Christ and therefore its abandonment or misconstruction is the cause of false or one-sided conceptions of Christianity. In the mind of Leighton Williams, the Biblical idea of the kingdom was not a fixed but a growing conception having been revealed first to the prophets of Israel and transformed by Christ "into something at once universal, spiritual and social."

In thus rejecting the apocalyptic interpretation of the teaching of Jesus, the Brotherhood was following the accepted New Testament scholarship of the day. Other commentators who were not members of the fellowship held similar views. Francis Greenwood Peabody of Harvard, whose book *Jesus Christ and the Social Question* stands as perhaps the solidest of many works written on the social teachings of Jesus at about the turn of the century, quoting Matthew Arnold, declared that Jesus must be taken "over the heads" of his contemporaries, that he could hardly have held the crassly materialistic views inherent in the apocalyptic ideal.¹¹ Shailer Mathews, whose book on *The Social Teaching of Jesus*, published in 1897, was the first significant American work on its subject, declared that while Jesus could not have been expected to use the word evolution in reference to his kingdom, that the concept of development was essentially what he had in mind.¹² It hardly seems necessary to point out that the general course of New Testament scholarship has since taken a somewhat different view.

We come then to the social aspects of the kingdom. Here again it was basically a religious conception. Implicit in the idea of divine fatherhood was the correlated belief in the brotherhood of man. These two truths Batten regarded as "the measure and type and inspiration of every social obligation." Now, he said, man is a being of relationships. As long as these relationships are imperfect we cannot have perfect men; therefore the perfection of the individual is conditioned upon the perfection of the social order of which he is a part.

The Kingdom of God means the creation from the base upwards of a pure and holy condition of the universal life of man. In its essence it is the conception of a society on earth in which Fatherhood and Brotherhood

11 Francis Greenwood Peabody, *Jesus Christ and the Social Question* (New York, 1900), 96ff.

12 Shailer Mathews, *The Social Teaching of Jesus* (New York, 1897), chapter IX.

find their full expression, a society of which love is the law, holiness the attribute and peace the happy issue. Christ's purposes on earth are ethical and social.¹³

¹³ Batten, *op. cit.*, 127.

The kingdom is the reign of God consciously and freely realized in every part of his universe. The institutions of men are not the kingdom, nor can they ever be; they are only so many realms in which the reign of God is realized upon earth.

The principles of the kingdom are to find incarnation in our lives, in our homes, in our churches and in our states; social customs are to be inspired, church bodies to be motivated, national policies to be dictated, industrial orders to be framed, and legislative halls to be conformed by the great eternal principles of the kingdom,—righteousness, peace and joy in a holy Spirit.¹⁴

The religious quality of the Kingdom ideal did not isolate its believers from active participation in social reform. The kingdom includes the "right social order," declared Leighton Williams, while Batten remarked that "it ought to go without saying that every believer in the kingdom is interested in everything that makes for the temporal and eternal well being of men." At the fifth conference, Nathaniel Schmidt asserted that "We must enter manfully the arena of social discussion, with a protest against violence in every form and insistence upon peaceful agitation and constitutional methods, with a warning against deceitfulness of riches, and such faithful teachings as will fit men for self-government."¹⁵ The wide range of social topics discussed at the conferences bear out the social aspect of the central ideal of the fellowship even further.

We next note the unifying aspect of the kingdom ideal. The prominence of the problem of church unity has been pointed out; it took on new significance in the light of the kingdom. The kingdom involves the unity of all believers, declared Leighton Williams; "we cannot rest satisfied with the divided state of the Christian church."¹⁶ While unity was an important theme, the church was not regarded as the ultimate goal. "The Kingdom, rather than the Church, the Unifying Aim," was the title of a paper read at the conference of 1895 by Batten, who asserted that all real unity must be based upon

¹⁴ *Op. cit.*, 128.

¹⁵ Nathaniel Schmidt, "The Kingdom of God in Modern Life," *Report of the fifth conference, etc.* (1897), 6.

¹⁶ Williams, *op. cit.*, 12.

faith in one Lord, life in one Spirit, and endeavor in one Kingdom. The only object of the church, he said, is the extension of the kingdom of God.¹⁷ "The Church does not embrace all the forces of the Kingdom and is but a means for the advancement of the Kingdom," wrote Rauschenbusch in Brotherhood Leaflet No. 4.

Examination of the Brotherhood's analysis of the kingdom idea might be pursued almost indefinitely, so broad was the interpretation of it and so many and varied the discussions. It was frequently stated that loss of the kingdom conception throughout the history of the church was largely responsible for the impotence of modern Christianity. But one further significant point will suffice to round out the main outlines of the Brotherhood's central idea. The concluding division of Batten's essay that we have several times quoted, dealt with the progressive realization of the kingdom. No aspect of the thought of social gospellers as a whole more effectively describes them as children of their age than does the word "progressive." Applied first to advancing theological views such as those of the Andover theologians in the 1880's, "progressive" later became a political catch-word representative of a particular reform philosophy popularized by Theodore Roosevelt and Woodrow Wilson. That the kingdom should be progressively realized—by evolution—indicates the close relation of social gospel thought to the intellectual and social ideology of the times. The Brotherhood regarded the coming of the kingdom as a moral process. Indications of its coming, according to Batten, were not to be sought in signs and wonders, but in "the progress of righteousness and the advancing life of humanity." Apocalyptic and millennial views he regarded as literalism and materialism. What are the social movements of our times but the comings of the Son of Man?, he asked. The New Jerusalem is all the time descending from God out of heaven to be set up on earth.¹⁸

It is, however, in a real sense yet to come. The present order is not divine. God does not sanction the feast of Dives and the starvation of Lazarus. That a social system shall prevail in which one man, by financiering and speculation, can become the controller of millions of dollars and thousands of

17 *Report of the third conference, etc.* (1895), 8.

18 Batten, *op. cit.*, pp. 129-130.

lives; that able bodied young men shall walk the streets in desperation looking for a job—these things are no part of the kingdom. At this point the practical aim of the Brotherhood was brought into play: it is one of our special tasks, declared Rauschenbusch at the conference of 1895, "to wed Christianity and the social movement, infusing the power of religion into social efforts, and helping religion to find its ethical outcome in the transformation of social conditions."¹⁹ This belief was phrased in a corporate way by the Brotherhood in 1908, when, in an address to the churches of the United States, it declared that the kingdom idea "is adequate for continuous reconstructions because it is of the same structure, laws, ideals, principles and life as the Kingdom of God in Heaven or in any kind of colony of the universal kingdom. To it is given the task of extending its rule until the consummation of social reconstructions is reached in which God shall be all in all."²⁰ And, said Samuel Zane Batten, such a consummation would be achieved through agencies resident in humanity: slowly but surely the gospel of the crucified Nazarene is penetrating the heathenisms of the earth. The effort to advance the kingdom is not a hopeless struggle. The Kingdom ideal has been the potency of countless revolutions in the past and contains the prophecy of more to come. "The only hope for the world is in the Gospel of the Kingdom, with its crucified Savior, its law of love, its doctrine of brotherhood, its passion for righteousness, and its message of peace."²¹

All these aspirations of the Brotherhood were summed up in an oft-quoted phrase of Rauschenbusch in his leaflet *The Brotherhood of the Kingdom*:

We desire to see the Kingdom of God once more the great object of Christian preaching; the inspiration of Christian hymnology; the foundation of systematic theology; the enduring motive of evangelistic and missionary work; the religious inspiration of social work and the object to which a Christian man surrenders his life, and in that surrender saves it to eternal life; the common object in which all religious bodies find their

19 Walter Rauschenbusch, "The Ideals of Social Reformers," *Report of the third conference*, etc. (1895), 26.

20 This statement was printed in *The Kingdom* for August-October, 1908 (pages unnumbered). *The Kingdom* was published at New Haven, Connecticut, by W. H. Gardner, a member of the Brotherhood, from August, 1907, irregularly until January, 1909. Broken files of the magazine are available in the New York Public Library and the American Baptist Historical Society collection at Chester, Pennsylvania.

21 Batten, *op. cit.*, 132.

unity; the great synthesis in which the regeneration of the spirit, the enlightenment of the intellect, the development of the body, the reform of political life, the sanctification of industrial life, and all that concerns the redemption of humanity shall be embraced.²²

To the accomplishment of these aims the Brotherhood worked quietly and steadily. It made no concerted effort to secure members or to propagate its beliefs other than by word of mouth, through friendship and fellowship, by means of sermons, magazine articles, the circulation of essays in pamphlet form, and through the books written by individuals. "The extension of the Brotherhood is not the extension of an organization," declared a speaker at the conference of 1897, "but the dissemination of the idea of the kingdom of God for which we stand. We seek in all ways to make the idea of the kingdom which we cherish the common property of all of God's people." To this end several series of tracts were printed and the proceedings of the annual conferences were published, although not every year. From August 1907 until January, 1909, the Rev. W. H. Gardner of New Haven, a member of the Brotherhood, attempted the publication of a magazine entitled *The Kingdom*, dedicated to the propagation of the fellowship's ideal. Several branches were established, notably in Rochester, in Boston, and in New York. The New York group centered around Leighton Williams at Amity Church; it carried on various activities of which we unfortunately have no records. The Boston chapter, of which E. Tallmadge Root was the leading spirit, was formed about 1914 and lapsed in 1932. It included among its members George W. Coleman, sponsor of the Ford Hall Forums, the Rev. O. P. Gifford, Woodman Bradbury, and Roger W. Babson.

The Rochester chapter appears to have been formed not long after Walter Rauschenbusch returned to his home city in 1897. It held monthly meetings given to devotions and discussion and was, doubtless, one of the influences that led Rauschenbusch to write his *Prayers of the Social Awakening*. It prepared a list of social gospel topics on which its members offered to speak. One of these circulars described the organization as consisting of men and women who "believe in the application of Christian principles and forces to the wider

²² Quoted by Williams, *op. cit.*, 14. The writer has been unable to locate a copy of the original essay, published as Brotherhood Leaflet No. 2.

social life of humanity" and who hold the basic aim of Christianity to be "the establishment of the Kingdom of God on earth," a process involving not only the conversion of individuals but "the Christianizing of all human relations." Members of the local group, which included Paul Moore Strayer, Carl A. Daniel, F. C. A. Jones, Louis Kaiser, H. S. Weet, Harrie R. Chamberlain, John H. Strong, J. W. A. Stewart, and a number of others, offered to speak on such subjects as the kingdom ideal, socialism, child labor, social problems and related themes.²³ Perhaps the experience of Carl A. Daniel was typical; "Professor Rauschenbusch and I," he wrote years afterward, "appeared before the Labor Lyceum of Rochester a few times discussing problems of labor from the Christian point of view and experienced some bitter criticisms."²⁴

The world at large came to know of the ideals of the Brotherhood chiefly through the published writings of its members. The first book to attract a wide audience was Samuel Zane Batten's *The New Citizenship*, which won a \$600 prize from the American Sunday School Union in 1898. In it Batten declared that "The Kingdom of God is all-inclusive and comprehends every interest and relation and activity of man." The next year three significant essays by members appeared: *The Republic of Man*, by Nathaniel Schmidt; an exegetical study entitled *The Kingdom*, by George Dana Boardman; and a treatment of the Biblical ethics of wealth by E. Tallmadge Root, "*The Profit of the Many*." In 1905, Schmidt's scholarly treatise, *The Prophet of Nazareth*, came from the press.

But by all odds the most important writings by members of the Brotherhood were those of Walter Rauschenbusch, whose epochal book, *Christianity and the Social Crisis*, appearing in 1907, made its author at once the acknowledged leader of American social Christianity and soon acquainted the Protestant world with the basic tenets for which the Brotherhood had long labored. In this book, as in his later works, Rauschenbusch stated the social gospel in terms of the realization of the kingdom ideal—the kingdom ideal that had been the subject of so many Brotherhood papers and discussions.

23 "An Offer of the Brotherhood of the Kingdom—Rochester Chapter," in *The Rochester Baptist Monthly* (Rochester, New York), XXI, Oct., 1906, No. 1, p. 34.

24 Letter to the writer, February 28, 1936.

Indeed, the appearance of *Christianity and the Social Crisis* was a sort of crisis for the Brotherhood. When the conference of 1907 met at Marlborough, it frankly faced the problem of whether its work being accomplished, it might not well disband. The wide reception given to Rauschenbusch's book was regarded as a vindication of the fellowship's efforts "to establish the social nature of Christianity." We have contended for the kingdom ideal, declared Leighton William in a paper at that conference, and we have assailed the present social order as essentially unrighteous and contrary to the will of God. We have maintained that it is the duty of Christians to interest themselves in social questions. Quoting Frederick Denison Maurice, he asserted that the Brotherhood had opposed both "unsocial Christians and unchristian socialists" and had been disliked and feared by both. The group had nevertheless held its ground for fifteen years and was perhaps the oldest organization of its kind in the country. And now, he said, we may point to Rauschenbusch's book with pride "as a finished exposition of our opinions and thank him most heartily for it." But, continued Williams, there is still a vast work to do.²⁵ And so the Brotherhood continued in its quiet way to meet each summer on the consecrated hilltop overlooking the Hudson, although with an increasing sense of a completed task. In 1909 Rauschenbusch wrote in the Visitors' Book:

Only where mind touches mind does the mind do its best work. Where love and confidence draw back the bars and bolts of caution and distrust thought passes easily from heart to heart, and finds ready lodgment. So we grow . . . God bless this hill-top temple of the spirit . . . May it do for others in the future what it did for me in the past.

When the Northern Baptist Convention first met in 1908, Samuel Zane Batten and several other members of the Brotherhood began what was to be a significant work in organizing its social service activities. The kingdom ideal played a large part in the subsequent reports of this body, and in the ideology expressed in the study courses it developed. In 1909 Batten produced another book, *The Christian State*. In 1911, now a professor in Des Moines College and Chairman of the Convention's Social Service Commission, he wrote *The Social Task of Christianity*, which was subtitled "A summons to the new

²⁵ Leighton Williams, *The Reign of the New Humanity*, Amity Tract No. 11 (n. p., 1907), 2.

crusade." In 1911 also William Newton Clarke published a book entitled *The Ideal of Jesus*, in which he declared that "the kingdom of God is the embodiment of the ideal of Jesus," a position that had received less explicit sanction in his earlier works. The next year came the second of Rauschenbusch's great books, *Christianizing the Social Order*, although in *For God and the People*, published in 1910, the kingdom ideal had played a large part in these "Prayers of the social awakening." In *Christianizing the Social Order*, Rauschenbusch paid tribute to the Brotherhood. It has been too unselfish to become large, he said, but it was a powerful stimulus in those early days of isolation. Of all the ideas we tried to work out, there is not one but has become a recognized and commanding issue. Of the men who trusted to the inner voice and the outer call, he continued, a number have risen to positions of acknowledged leadership, a fact attributable to the all-inclusive conception of Christianity that they adopted having set them large tasks, "unified their otherwise scattered interests, inspired them with religious joy, compelled them to fight for God, and so made strong men of them."²⁶

In September, 1914—an ominous month in the world's history—twenty-three persons signed Rauschenbusch's testimonial in the Visitors' Book at Marlborough:

We men and women of the Brotherhood have met once more at our beloved sanctuary in order to feel the elation of fellowship, the spur of sincere intellectual inquiry, and the calm of tranquil worship. We remember the loving friends of former years, and thank God for the far-flung band of our brothers and friends who are standing for the Brotherhood ideals, each in his own place. We re-affirm with increased faith the fundamental conviction to which our Brotherhood has given prophetic utterance, and we make new dedication of ourselves—for the years still left to us—to the task of preaching the glad news of the growing Reign of God and of getting it organized in the practical affairs of men.

The last entry in the Visitors' Book records the names of twenty-two members of the fellowship who met for their twentieth conference in 1915. In the now enfeebled hand of the Rev. H. H. Peabody of Rome, who had signed the first inscription in 1893, a few words in memory of William Newton Clarke, George Dana Boardman, Norman Fox and others—"our absent members in the homeland"—comprised the final chronicle of these Brothers of the Kingdom, whose Franciscan quest was

26 Rauschenbusch, *Christianizing the Social Order*, 94.

swallowed up before another summer by the obliterating hatreds of a world conflict.

But that was not the end. In the spring of 1917, during the very days in which America opened hostilities against Germany and while rattling war drums seemed to sound the knell of all that he had lived and labored for, Walter Rauschenbusch quietly presented his mature thought on the platform of the Taylor Lectureship at Yale University. The subsequent book, *A Theology for the Social Gospel*, regarded by many as his greatest, set the doctrine of the kingdom of God at the heart of social Christianity, phrasing in its final form the ideal that had been fused in the crucible of prayer and discussion throughout thirty years.

CONRAD GREBEL, THE FOUNDER OF SWISS ANABAPTISM

HAROLD S. BENDER

Goshen College, Goshen, Ind.

The age of the Reformation, as one of the creative periods in the history of the Western church, was rich in great personalities. The challenge of the time brought some men to heroic heights, while it took scores of lesser men out of their small corners and flung them into the great stream of movement and action which was remaking the world, where they were compelled to assume places of leadership. The names, and often the life stories, of many of the characters of four hundred years ago are still familiar to us today. Some of them are household names. But there are no Anabaptist names among them, even though the Anabaptist movement represents a distinct type of continental Protestantism. Menno Simons, the sturdy leader of Dutch Mennonitism, is perhaps most widely known of the Anabaptist leaders, although the quadricentennial of his conversion from Catholicism to the Anabaptist movement, which was celebrated last year by Mennonites round the world, passed scarcely noticed. But Menno was not the founder of Anabaptism, and ten years before he appeared on the theatre of action most of the original founders and leaders of Anabaptism in its birthland in Switzerland and South Germany were numbered among the martyrs. The careers of these Swiss leaders were so short that even among their present-day Mennonite descendants most of them had been totally forgotten until they were revived in recent years by modern historical research; and today there is no living tradition attached to their names. It is true that as long ago as 1910 Adolph von Harnack could say in his *History of Dogma*: "Thanks to the research of recent years we have been presented with figures of splendid Christian leaders from among the circles of the Anabaptists, and many of these noble and reverend characters come nearer to us than the figures of an heroic Luther and an iron Calvin." Harnack probably had in mind, in addition to Menno Simons,

such names as Hans Denk, the semi-mystical South German leader who was active in the group for a brief year, only to abandon it on his death-bed, and Dr. Balthasar Hubmaier, the greatest literary figure among the early Anabaptists, but not the most typical representative. More recently other names such as Conrad Grebel, George Blaurock, Felix Manz, Michael Sattler, Wilhelm Reublin, Jacob Hutter, Pilgram Marpeck, Leopold Scharnschlager, have gradually come to the fore. However, even they must for the most part remain merely names, for but the meagrest details of their careers and personalities have been preserved, and these have become accessible only as the result of painstaking research.

Of these lesser names of early Anabaptism, the name of Conrad Grebel is easily the most important. Much less widely known than a Denk or a Hubmaier, he is nevertheless of vastly greater significance. We know today that he was the founder of the Anabaptist movement, that without him Anabaptism in its historical form would probably never have come into existence. He represents original Anabaptism in its pure form, the form in which it has been perpetuated to the present day, whereas Denk and Hubmaier represent sideward movements from the main stream, both of which diverged significantly on major points and both of which rapidly died out.¹

Grebel was viewed as the outstanding leader of original Swiss Anabaptism, (properly to be called "The Swiss Brethren" movement,) by his enemies, as well as his followers. Zwingli viewed him as the head of the new heretical faction

¹ Since it may be new to some that a comparatively unknown figure like Grebel should be reckoned as the founder of Anabaptism rather than such an one as Thomas Muntzer, who has been traditionally viewed as the originator of the movement at least in idea if not in person, perhaps a few facts should be mentioned at this point. The most recent authoritative opinion agrees that the cradle of Anabaptism was Zurich, Switzerland, and that the first Anabaptist group was formed out of the inner circle of Zwingli's supporters. It agrees also that it was not a revolutionary movement, but a thoroughly peaceful one even to the point of absolute pacifism, with a predominantly religious focus and concern, and that the matter of baptism of infant children was the issue on which the first break with Zwinglianism came. Thomas Muntzer, however, was a Lutheran pastor in Saxony, far nearer to Wittenberg both geographically and ideologically than to Zurich, and remained Lutheran in his basic theology to the end, even though he became an unbalanced social and religious revolutionary ready to use the sword to avenge the righteous against their oppressors. Furthermore, he not only never practiced adult baptism, but wrote the first Protestant liturgy for the baptism of children (1523) and was rebuked by Conrad Grebel for failing to abandon infant baptism. In fact, Muntzer was in no sense an Anabaptist, but rather an erring Lutheran, as the latest interpretations of him by Boehmer, Lohmann, and Brandt have shown.

in Zurich. In January, 1525, just after the break with what was destined to become the Anabaptist group, he wrote to Vadian, "Conrad Grebel and a few other less important persons are holding fast to their standpoint," In a letter to Oecolampad and others in November, 1526, shortly after Grebel's death, Zwingli referred to Grebel as "the ringleader (*coryphaeus*) of the Anabaptists." Johannes Kessler of St. Gall, in his famous Reformation diary, *Sabbata*, calls Grebel the arch-Anabaptist ("*der Erzwidertouffer*"). And the records of a very important disputation held in 1538 between the evangelical preachers of Berne and the Bernese Anabaptist leaders, the minutes of which still lie unpublished in the state archives in Berne (labeled "*Unnütze Papiere*") indicate that the brethren counted Grebel as the "First Anabaptist" ("*der erste Täufer*"). Conclusive evidence of Grebel's position of leadership in the founding of the Anabaptist movement comes from a highly interesting account of the actual birth of Anabaptism which tells us that Grebel performed the first adult baptism in Zurich on the night of January 21, 1525.²

The attempt to trace the career, theology, and significance of Conrad Grebel is hampered severely by scarcity of sources. His was a short life (ca. 1498-1526) with scarcely three years of public activity of a sort sufficiently important to bring his name into public records or into the private correspondence of contemporary leaders, and all that is said of Grebel in both of these sources could probably be written without difficulty on less than three type-written pages. The only writing of any sort which he prepared for publication—a brief pamphlet of less than five thousand words—has been lost, and can with difficulty be only partially reconstructed from the translated quotations found in Zwingli's counter-attack in the *Elenchus*. Three relatively insignificant short poems have been preserved, and one important short petition to the Zurich Council in 1524.

² The story found its way into the remarkable manuscript chronicle of the Hutterian Brethren, known as the *Grosses Geschichts-Buch* which has been maintained by that group from the year 1534 to the present day. In that account of the epochal meeting in the house of Felix Manz, when fifteen brethren were gathered in prayer after the mandate of the Zurich council proscribing the further propagation of their faith, we are told that as they arose from prayer, moved by the Spirit of God, George Blaurock asked Conrad Grebel to baptise him on the confession of his faith, thus recognizing Grebel as the spiritual leader of the little company. This Conrad Grebel did, thus performing the first adult baptism in Reformation times, the model for millions of similar baptisms since that day.

Fortunately, sixty-nine letters written by Grebel (in addition to three written to him) have been preserved. They were written between September, 1517, and July, 1525, two to Ulrich Zwingli, one to Thomas Müntzer, one to a co-worker named Andreas Castelberger of Zurich, nine to Oswald Myconius of Lucerne, and fifty-six to Grebel's close friend, former teacher, and brother-in-law, Dr. Joachim von Watt, the reformer of the Swiss city of St. Gall, commonly known as Vadian. Most of these letters, however, were written during Grebel's student years at Vienna and Paris, and are of practically no value in the important phase of his life as Anabaptist leader. The three letters to Grebel which have been preserved, include one from Benedikt Burgauer (1523), a minor evangelical preacher of St. Gall, one from Erhard Hegenwalt, a young evangelical friend in Wittenberg (1525), and one from Vadian (1524). One book of Grebel's library has been preserved in the state library in Zurich.

The Grebel Family

Conrad Grebel was born about 1498 as the second of six children to Junker Jacob Grebel and his wife, Dorothea Fries. For a century and a half the Grebel family had been one of the leading families of the city of Zurich, one of the small number of wealthy patrician families of the lesser landed nobility who had for years directed the political, economic, and military affairs of the city. The family had always had one or more members in the city council and usually furnished the guild-master for one of the aristocratic merchant guilds. Grebels had frequently served as magistrates, and for two generations prior to the Reformation no important political event took place in Zurich in which a Grebel did not have part. The most influential of all the Grebels was Junker Jacob Grebel, Conrad's father, a wealthy iron merchant, who reached the peak of a successful career in politics in the first years of the Reformation. From 1499 to 1512 he served a double term as magistrate (*Vogt*) of the territory of Grüningen, and from that time on served as a representative of the canton of Zurich at practically all of the meetings of the Swiss Confederacy, as well as serving frequently as plenipotentiary in important Swiss and foreign negotiations.

Jacob Grebel's family also played its full part in the

patrician social life of the city of Zurich and northeast Switzerland. The daughters married prominent men, one becoming the wife of Dr. Vadian, noted humanist professor and sometime rector of the University of Vienna, later burgomaster and reformer of the city of St. Gall. The two sons of Jacob Grebel, one of whom died young, were given every advantage that wealth and prestige could bring them, one becoming a courtier in King Ferdinand's court in Vienna, and the other, Conrad, being sent to the best universities of the time, Basel, Vienna, and Paris.

At the height of prestige, fate struck the family heavy blows. The only surviving son, Conrad, became an Anabaptist heretic, dying as an exile in 1526, while father Jacob Grebel was executed in disgrace a few months later on the charge of receiving foreign pensions. However, the family name survived, the sons of Conrad being reared by his surviving relatives in the Reformed faith, and Grebels continued to be prominent in the affairs of Zurich. A grandson of the Anabaptist Conrad, also named Conrad, became treasurer of the city in 1624, and the latter's grandson, another Conrad Grebel, became burgomaster in 1669. The present President of the Supreme Court of the Canton of Zurich is Dr. Hans von Grebel, the only direct male descendant of the Anabaptist Conrad Grebel who bears the Grebel name.

Perhaps H. Richard Niebuhr is right in asserting in his book, *The Social Sources of Denominationalism*, that the Anabaptist movement was a movement of the socially and economically oppressed lower classes, but it is difficult to apply this theory to the founder of the movement, Conrad Grebel, the wealthy, socially elite, university-trained patrician son of an unusually successful father.

Grebel's Education

Conrad Grebel probably grew up as a lad in the castle at Grüningen, a few miles east of Zurich, where his father was magistrate during Conrad's boyhood days. His education must have begun in the Latin School of the Grossmünster church in Zurich, known as the "*Carolina*" because it was supposed to have been founded by Charlemagne. Here he received the typical Latin training of the time, quite in the old-fashioned scholastic spirit.

His university career began in October, 1514, when he matriculated for the winter semester at the University of Basel, which was at that time in a very low state, with an average of 50 new matriculants each semester. The newer humanism was just beginning to come in. The outstanding Swiss humanist of the younger school, Glarean (Heinrich Loriti), had just come to Basel and established a *bursa*, or boarding academy. Since all the students of the philosophical faculty were required to live in one of the numerous *bursae*, Grebel joined Glarean's *bursa*. Fortunately, Glarean was an excellent teacher, and under his tutelage the young Grebel was introduced for the first time into the world of humanist learning and living. Basel was barely beginning to come into its glory as a humanist center. Erasmus had come two months before, in August, 1514, to remain through the winter. The great Froben had begun his career as an independent printer the year before, in 1513. Beatus Rhenanus had been there since 1511, Hans Holbein the younger came possibly during the winter of 1514-1515, Oecolampad came in 1515, Amerbach, Fonteius, and other lesser humanist scholars were already occupied as proof-readers in the great printing houses. The growing humanist life was just organizing itself, the foreigners gathering around Erasmus and Rhenanus in the famous *Sodalitas Basiliensis*, while the lesser Swiss group gathered around the young Glarean. It was in this latter group that the stripling Conrad Grebel moved during the first semester of study, probably scarcely aware of the significance of his environment. Before he could enter fully into this new life, his father transferred him to the University of Vienna, where he had secured a four-year stipend for him from the Emperor Maximilian.

A constant stream of young Swiss students, particularly from Zurich and eastern Switzerland, had been flowing to Vienna for the preceding five years, partly under the influence of Ulrich Zwingli, who had himself studied there in 1501. The center of the Swiss student group in Vienna was a famous Swiss humanist professor from the city of St. Gall, Switzerland, Vadian, who took it upon himself to become the friend and patron of the Swiss boys. Vadian had been in Vienna since 1510, had a doctor's degree in medicine as well as philosophy, was a noted humanist poet, crowned poet laureate in 1514 by the emperor, was appointed professor of rhetoric in 1516

as successor to the great Angelo Cospi, and the same year elected rector of the university.

When Conrad Grebel came to Vienna to enroll as a student in the summer of 1515, to remain for three years until June, 1518, he naturally became a part of the Swiss group gathered around Vadian. Indeed, he soon became an intimate friend and protégé of the great professor. The warmth and intimacy of this friendship is eloquently attested by the fifty-six extant letters written by young Grebel to his "dearest teacher and most faithful friend." Vadian encouraged and promoted the young scholar in every possible way, recognizing in him outstanding gifts and a splendid personality well-qualified for future leadership. He seems to have counted him as the most promising of the Swiss students. Out of this friendship came good fortune for Vadian, for it brought him in the summer of 1519 Conrad's charming younger sister Martha as wife.

When Vadian suddenly left Vienna in June, 1518 partly because of the plague which was raging, and partly because he had decided to exchange a professorship in Vienna for the life of a physician and scholar in his native St. Gall, young Grebel went with him. However, he remained in Zurich but a short time, for his father had secured a royal scholarship from the king of France for his son—one of the two which were being granted annually by King Francis I to each Swiss canton—and in September he set out for Paris on what was intended to be the climax of a successful scholastic career. There he spent two further years, certainly in study, although the rather inadequate matriculation records of the university do not contain his name. He went to Paris with high hopes, being particularly happy again to join the *bursa* conducted by his former Basel teacher, Glarean, for the latter had conducted a *bursa* for Swiss students in Paris since 1517.

But the high hopes with which Grebel came to Paris were not to be fulfilled. After three months he became involved in a serious quarrel with Glarean and left him, not to return until an entire year had passed. And in July, 1519, a severe plague broke out in Paris which drove Grebel and his friends away from the city for six months. His troubles were further increased when he became involved in several student brawls.

He also suffered somewhat from illness due to his loose living, and finally his father, becoming incensed at reports he had received, cut him off from funds. Even Vadian threatened to break off his friendship and practically ceased writing. Under the blows of fate and circumstance Grebel lost heart and returned home to Zurich, his high hopes disappointed, without having completed his studies or secured any kind of degree. It was the end of his student days. He determined to seek a reconciliation with his parents and Vadian, and hoped for some career in his home city, although his self-confidence had been badly shaken and his inner life was full of conflict.

For almost six years, Conrad Grebel was a student among the humanists of the universities, and it is of importance to inquire the significance of his training. His chief teachers were Vadian and Heiligmaier at Vienna, and Glarean and Nicholas Beraldus at Paris, of whom Glarean and Vadian alone exerted a significant influence upon him. It is true that in Paris Glarean counted in the circle of his friends the great Budaeus and Faber Stapulensis, but there is no evidence of any sort that Grebel came into contact with them or was influenced by them. Alike in Paris, Vienna, and Basel, Grebel's contacts were primarily with the newer type of transalpine literary humanism, which characterized the better Swiss, French, German, and Austrian humanists. While this humanism was not the decadent, immoral, pagan, Italian type, it was also not the Christian humanism of the Erasmian type. Men like Vadian and Glarean were solid, stable scholars, whose chief concern in life was to promote the liberal arts, to write poetry, to study geography, mathematics and natural history, and to enjoy the fellowship of like-minded spirits. They were not greatly concerned about a moral and religious reform of society, for they had not yet been caught in the growing tide of interest in the great Christian Renaissance which Erasmus was promoting with ever-increasing zeal. This is the type of humanism to which Grebel was exposed, and which is reflected in the numerous letters which he wrote to Vadian and Myconius (one to Zwingli) during his student days. At the university he learned Latin, Greek, and probably Hebrew, learned to write Latin well, to appreciate the great classic writers and scholars, but failed to acquire any new religious concerns or attitudes. He did not become a pagan, for he retained his

traditional faith in the church and her dogmas, but neither did he become an Erasmian reformer.

If Conrad Grebel ever acquired a humanistic interest in the Erasmian type of reform of religion—which is more than doubtful—it could have come only during the late months of 1520 and 1521 after his return to Zurich. There he sought and found fellowship in the little group of returned students and humanists who gathered with Zwingli to study Greek and Hebrew during the early years of Zwingli's ministry in Zurich; but he found little satisfaction in this activity. At odds with his father, he finally decided to leave home to seek a career as a proof-reader in Basel. But this project likewise did not succeed, and after two months in the printing establishment of Cratander in Basel (August to September, 1521) he returned to Zurich again, hoping to break down the bitter opposition of his parents to his proposed marriage with a girl below his social status. Failing in this, he suddenly went through with the marriage in February, 1522, during one of the frequent absences of his father from home. The break with his family was complete, and was only partially restored by the mediation of one of the city pastors, an associate of Zwingli. During this period of stress and strain, lasting a year and a half, Grebel may have been influenced by Zwingli's more religiously motivated type of humanism, but it is exceedingly doubtful if this was the case. There are no traces of such influence in his correspondence during this period.

As we come to the close of Grebel's humanist period, and see that it made no evident contribution to his religious life or thinking, it may be worth while to point out that this conclusion seriously militates against the theory of the humanist origin of Anabaptism which has recently gained ground. Certainly Conrad Grebel did not become an Anabaptist because he was a humanist. If in the minds of some scholars Anabaptist theology and ethics seem to reflect somewhat Erasmian humanistic Christianity with its emphasis upon Sermon on the Mount ethics—a theory by the way which I cannot accept—the Erasmian influence certainly did not enter Anabaptism through Conrad Grebel, the founder of the movement.

Grebel as a Zwinglian

The year 1522 marked an epoch for Conrad Grebel which

was to lead to a transformation of his entire life. Unfortunately, there is a complete hiatus in his correspondence for nine months during this vital period, but from the middle of the year 1522 it is evident that Grebel was a changed man. Now he was deeply interested in the progress of the evangelical cause in Zurich; he became an ardent partisan of Zwingli and his reform program. The spirit and atmosphere as well as the content of his further correspondence are so radically different from what they were before that we must believe that a genuine conversion and renewal of life took place during the spring of 1522. The explanation is not far to seek. Grebel was won by the powerful gospel preaching of Ulrich Zwingli, as many other citizens of Zurich were. From the beginning of his career in Zurich in 1519, Zwingli had carried through a strikingly new program of expository preaching covering many of the books of the New Testament. Like the learned and respected canon, Dr. Heinrich Engelhart, who through Zwingli's preaching confessed that he was "changed from a doctor of Roman law to a poor scholar of Christ," Grebel was changed from a loose-living humanist university student to a devout and earnest Christian. Henceforth until his untimely death in the summer of 1526—four short years ahead—he was in the forefront of those who were bringing in the new era, first for a year and a half as an enthusiastic supporter of Zwingli, and then for over two years as the founder of the new Anabaptist movement.

As Zwingli from 1522 on gradually swung into a program of practical reform in Zurich after having laid the foundation through four years of preaching, Grebel went with him. Almost at once he was a leader in the devoted group of younger men who stepped to Zwingli's side in the conflict. Zwingli recognized and valued Grebel's support and permitted him to publish a vigorous poetic ode hailing the Reformation in his booklet entitled *Archeteles* which was published in August, 1522. In October of that year Melchior Macrinus of Solothurn wrote to Zwingli that he had heard that Grebel had developed into an exceptional promoter of the gospel, a fact which gave Macrinus great joy, for such gifted and learned young men could render the gospel and the world a great service. During these months a very close and intimate friendship developed between Zwingli and Grebel. Zwingli apparently planned to

have Grebel appointed to the university or the theological school which he expected to establish. A few years later, after the break, Zwingli was very bitter over the broken friendship and complained of ingratitude on the part of Grebel for whom he had done so much.

The close relationship between Grebel and Zwingli was maintained until the second Zurich disputation of October, 1523. Grebel was happy to work at Zwingli's side, and recognized him as a true and faithful shepherd and leader of the church of Christ. In this period the views of the two men must have agreed in all essential respects. For instance, in the matter of tithes, one of the burning issues of the hour, Grebel indicated agreement with Zwingli. During this time he also formed a fast friendship with Felix Manz, another young Zurich student just returned from Paris, who had joined the ranks of the Zwinglians, and who was to become in January, 1527, the first Anabaptist martyr in Zurich.

Beginning however, with the October, 1523 disputation, a cleavage arose between Zwingli and Grebel, which gradually grew wider during the ensuing months, until in the fall of 1524 it led to a complete break. It went so far as to cause Zwingli to condemn Grebel and his friends publicly from the pulpit as "Satans going about as angels of light," while Grebel responded by condemning Zwingli and his assistants as false shepherds not true to the divine calling and the divine word.

It is not necessary to go into the story of the break in detail, the major points will suffice. The October disputation was called to put pressure on the city council to institute immediate reforms in the church life of Zurich by abolishing the mass and doing away with images. Zwingli made valiant speeches during the disputation urging this very thing. But when he saw that the slow-moving city fathers were not ready for such a radical step, he beat a strategic retreat. When Grebel observed the change of front, he at once openly protested and demanded that the city council should not be allowed to decide the matter, since all were agreed on what the word of God required. But Zwingli would not break with the council. As a matter of fact, the mass was not abolished by the council until May, 1525, almost two years later. During all the intervening time Zwingli and others continued to officiate at a ceremony which they had publicly condemned as an unscriptural

abomination. This strange compromise was a heavy burden on the conscience of many devout Zurichers, not only of Conrad Grebel, to whom it seemed as though the word of God was being set aside by, and made subordinate to, the action of a political body. Here then was the issue: should the civil state continue to dictate the faith and life and worship of the church, or should the pastors and laity themselves carry through the necessary reform in church life according to their God-given convictions? Fundamentally, the issue was whether the new evangelical movement was to eventuate in a state church under civil control as before, or in a new type of free voluntary organization. Both Luther and Zwingli, as well as the other reformers, faced this fundamental issue, and decided to continue the medieval state church with a predominant control by the civil state in the life and faith of the church. Perhaps it was a wise and statesmanlike decision, but in terms of absolute principle and plain Scripture teaching it was indefensible. At least so it seemed to Conrad Grebel.

Conrad Grebel and his friends went home from the October disputation shocked and dismayed. They felt they had been betrayed by the leader whom they trusted. Zwingli, on his part, bearing the burden of actual responsibility, sensing the strength of the Catholic opposition, could not help but view his critics as irresponsible young radicals who had not yet learned the lesson of patience. The difference in point of view cut deep, and during the winter months an earnest and serious debate was carried on between Zwingli on the one side, and his former friends and supporters on the other, particularly Grebel, Manz, and Stumpf. According to Zwingli's own testimony, these men came to him repeatedly with the proposal that he set up a new kind of voluntary Christian church, one composed of true believers only, willing to live a life of true righteousness before God and man according to the teaching of Christ and the apostles, and in which a gospel discipline would be maintained. This new church would be freed from state control, although its members would endeavor to secure a true Christian membership on the city council so that the latter would support and not hinder the work of the church. For months the struggle continued, Grebel hoping against hope that Zwingli would adopt this program, for apparently there had been some discussion of these principles earlier, with

Zwingli not at all averse to them. (In 1523, for instance, Zwingli had been willing to abandon infant baptism). But Zwingli had made up his mind that he would not follow the new plan. He feared the consequences. Would there be enough true Christians to carry on the church, and what would happen to the unregenerate mass of nominal Christians? Perhaps Zwingli was right, but at any rate the issue was clear between him and Grebel, and the break was inevitable. Grebel did not believe in considering consequences and trimming sails, he wanted absolute unflinching loyalty to the Word of God regardless of consequences. And he was willing to accept the consequences in his own personal experience.

Those who held to Grebel's position and joined him in the break with Zwingli—a small company of not more than fifteen men—did not rush into precipitate action. They met together frequently for fellowship and Bible study, Grebel and Manz expounding the Scripture from the original Greek and Hebrew text. They meditated, prayed, and waited. But while they waited they sought to find allies outside of Zurich. In this seeking Grebel took the lead. In the summer of 1524 he wrote to Dr. Carlstadt, who apparently had broken with Luther on somewhat similar grounds as Grebel had with Zwingli. And in October, Carlstadt himself appeared in Zurich for a short time, obviously to see whether he could establish himself with the Grebel group in a new program. But the bitter opposition of Zwingli, together with the evident weakness of the Grebel group, as well as possible differences of program, no doubt convinced him of the impracticability of the move, and Carlstadt faded out of the picture.

Meanwhile Grebel had heard of another Lutheran preacher who had apparently had a break with Luther—Thomas Müntzer of Altstedt in Saxony. Here might be a possible ally. He secured two of Müntzer's booklets in which he found much that was good, and some that was bad. But on the whole Müntzer seemed promising. So in September, 1524, he wrote to Müntzer in the name of his little group, encouraging him to continue in his opposition to Luther, but warning him of several false steps he was making.³ Before the letter was sent

³ The latest and best edition of this exceedingly important document is to be found in H. Boehmer u. P. Kirn, *Thomas Müntzers Briefwechsel*, Leipzig, 1931, pp. 92-101.

off, a Zurich friend returned from Saxony with the information that Müntzer was apparently ready to use violence to promote his program, and on the other hand seemed to be unwilling to dispense altogether with the ancient forms of worship of the church which had no basis in Scripture. So Grebel added an appendix to his letter, chiding Müntzer and expressing concern lest Müntzer should turn out to be a disappointment to those who were dissatisfied with Zwingli and Luther and wanted a true reformation and reconstruction of the church according to the Scripture alone, doing away with all mere customs and traditions of men. Grebel's fears were only too well-founded; Müntzer, too, proved to be a broken reed. However, even the hoped-for contact with Müntzer was never established, for Grebel's letter never reached Müntzer, but returned to Grebel and was apparently turned over upon his death to Vadian in St. Gall where it is found today among the Vadian manuscripts in the St. Gall library. Some scholars have erred in supposing that this letter proved a community of faith and practice between Grebel and Müntzer, whereas it actually proves the opposite. Müntzer probably died without ever having heard of Grebel and his group in Zurich. Later enemies of the Anabaptist movement, following the lead of Heinrich Bullinger, have insisted that Grebel and his friends frequently visited Müntzer during the latter's brief visit to Basel and southern Baden in November, 1524, two months after the above-mentioned letter was written. But there is not the slightest evidence of this. Zwingli never once mentioned it in his extensive attack on the Anabaptists, and certainly he would not have failed to connect them with Müntzer's revolution if he could have done so. The legend of the connection of the two is a pious fraud, a pure invention on the part of Bullinger who was anxious to clear the name of his beloved Zurich from the stain of the Anabaptist heresy and was glad to be able to assign the origin of the movement to an outside source in far-away Saxony.

It is worthy of note that Grebel also wrote to Luther in the summer of 1524, receiving no written answer but the assurance through a mutual friend that Luther was not ill-disposed toward Grebel and his group.

Having failed to establish any outside contact, Grebel and his group were forced to rely upon their own resources alone.

The closing months of the year 1524 were full of increasing conflict for them. Open threats from the pulpit, as well as private warnings, made it all too plain that suffering and persecution awaited them. In a touching letter to his friend Vadian, in December, 1524, Grebel indicates his fears for the future and yet his determination to press on unflinchingly upon the course he felt God wanted him to follow. He says, "I do not believe that persecution will fail to come . . . By their fruits ye shall know them, by persecution and sword . . . May God give grace; I hope to God that he will grant the medicine of patience thereto, if it is not to be otherwise . . . and may peace, faith, and salvation be established and obtained."⁴

The final break came over the question of infant baptism, although this was in reality merely a reflection of the major issue, which was that of the character of the church. The issue was whether the church was to be a universal organization including the entire population by birth and infant baptism as heretofore, or whether it was to be an organization composed of adult believers only who were prepared to assume the full obligations of discipleship. It was Zwingli and not Grebel who forced the issue in a bitter determination to root out the opposition to his program. The first refusals to baptize infants occurred in the spring of 1524 in the parish of Wilhelm Reublin, and were not due to Grebel's influence. However Grebel certainly sympathized with the objectors and without doubt supported them. Zwingli and the council sought to win the objectors to infant baptism by private discussion, but the objectors asked for Scripture proof that infant baptism was commanded, which of course could not be given, and all the devious and specious arguments which Zwingli and his fellow-pastors used could not move these simple-minded biblicists from their fundamental position. It was clear that only vigorous action, including the use of the force of the state if necessary, would suffice to quell what Zwingli called rebellion (*Aufruhr*). So the decision was made to hold a public debate on January 17, 1525, to be followed by a decree of the council on the matter. The story of the debate and its outcome is familiar history. As leader of the dissenting group, Grebel played a major part, assisted by Felix Manz and George Blau-

⁴ *Vadianische Briefsammlung*, herausg. Arbenz and Wartmann, St. Gallen, 1888-1913, Bd. III, p. 97.

rock. The outcome was two severe council mandates of the 18th and 21st of January, ordering a complete cessation of activity by Grebel and Manz and their associates, forbidding the Bible study meetings of the group, and ordering immediate baptism of all unbaptized infants on pain of exile from the canton. Grebel and his associates were compelled to come to a clear decision. The final break was at hand. Grebel himself had an unbaptized daughter two weeks old, which, as he said, "had not yet been baptized and bathed in the Romish water bath," and which he did not intend to baptize. No sooner was the issue raised than the answer was given. The Grebel group would not compromise under any circumstance, for their consciences were bound by the word of God as much as Luther's was at Worms. They felt that they had taken a scriptural position which had not been refuted from the Word of God by Zwingli and the city council. The Word of God was to be trampled under foot by the brutal power of the state. Already on the next day after the first mandate Zwingli knew the outcome, for he wrote to Vadian on the 19th, "Grebel persists in his stand."

Now when the little group of brethren met for counsel to determine their course of action, probably on the evening of the 21st, they had no program of introducing re-baptism. In fact, such a thing had never been mentioned in the entire course of the struggle. But in a moment of inspiration by what they confidently believed was divine guidance, adult baptism was introduced in this little meeting, with Grebel performing the first baptism, as related earlier in this article. This was the birthday of Anabaptism.

The story of the Anabaptist movement from this point on is familiar, and need not be repeated in detail here. The little group that had met on the evening of January 27, 1525, went out from their meeting with a sense of divine mission and endowment upon them. Fearing neither Zwingli nor the council, they went from house to house and into the towns and villages of the countryside teaching and preaching and urging men and women everywhere to join them in their new fellowship. The response with which they met was remarkable. In spite of repeated arrests and fines and imprisonments, the movement grew. Apparently it was not to be stopped. By Easter time Dr. Balthasar Hubmaier and practically his whole

parish in Waldshut had been baptised with three hundred adult participants, and in St. Gall Grebel had great success so that about five hundred were baptised at one time. In consternation the Zurich council called upon the other cantons of Switzerland to help to stamp out the heresy, for it was spreading to St. Gall, Appenzell, the Grisons, Aargau, Basel, Lucerne, Berne, in fact everywhere. Despairing of lesser measures, Zurich finally in November, 1526, established the death penalty by drowning for participation in the new movement. This example was followed widely within and without Switzerland. The movement was checked and soon limited to but a small number of families in scattered places, chiefly in the Valley of the Emme near Berne, although as late as 1700 there were still a few Anabaptists left in the Zurich countryside.

The strict Zurich mandates made it almost impossible for Grebel to stay in the city, where he was well-known, and carry on an aggressive program. Leaving the work in Zurich to less well-known co-workers, he set out on a mission to surrounding cities to win pastors and leaders to his cause. Several weeks in February, 1525, were spent in Schaffhausen, where it appeared for a time as though he might win Dr. Sebastian Hofmeister, the city pastor. Forced to leave the city, he returned to Zurich for a secret visit. Then followed a call to St. Gall about Easter time, where one of his associates, Wolfgang Uliman, whom he had baptized in the Rhine near Schaffhausen in February, was having remarkable success, and where he also perhaps hoped to find at least toleration at the hands of Vadian. After a successful mission there he returned to the neighborhood of Zurich and spent most of the summer preaching with considerable success in the territory of Grüningen just east of Zurich, working much with the village pastors. In October, 1525, he was taken captive together with Manz and Blaurock and put in prison in Zurich on an indeterminate sentence; but by good fortune the entire group escaped in March, 1526, after six months imprisonment, and at once resumed their preaching activity.

During the winter in prison, Grebel evidently succeeded in preparing a brief defense of the position of the group on baptism in reply to the arguments advanced by Zwingli. He had tried during the summer before to accomplish this and to

find a printer, but was frustrated in his intentions. It seems that after his escape from prison he succeeded in finding a printer and circulating a small number of the booklets. No copy is extant, but Zwingli attempted to refute the booklet in detail in his *Elenchus* which was published in July, 1527.

Worn and weary, in ill health from the long imprisonment and the hardships he had been compelled to undergo, Grebel thought to find a safer field of labor and possibly the rest and quiet which he so sorely needed by going to the region of Maienfeld in the Canton of the Grisons, where his oldest sister had been living for some time. There is no record of his movements or activities in this region, except for the brief statement in Kessler's *Sabbata* that shortly after his arrival in Maienfeld he died of the plague. Nothing is known of his burial place, nor of the exact time of his death, although it must have taken place about July, 1526.

Grebel's Theology

Zwingli considered his struggle with the Anabaptists in Zurich 1524-1527 to be a desperately serious conflict. As early as May, 1525, he wrote his friend Vadian that all previous conflicts (referring to the Catholic opposition) were as child's play compared with this one.⁵ The seriousness of the conflict was due not so much to the number of the Anabaptists as to the power of their ideas and the conviction with which they were held. What were these ideas of Conrad Grebel and his associates which Zwingli feared and with which he differed so radically?

In the first place, they were not ideas referring to the heart of the Christian faith. It can be said without contradiction that on all the cardinal points of Christian theology Zwingli and Grebel agreed, for the former repeatedly declared that the Grebelites differed from him only on unimportant minor points. In his *Commentary on True and False Religion* written in March, 1525, he says, "But that no one may suppose that the dissension is in regard to doctrines which concern the inner man, let it be said that the Anabaptists make us difficulty only because of unimportant outward things, such as these: whether infants or adults should be baptized and whether a Christian may be a magistrate."⁶ Zwingli was probably wrong in his

5 *Huldreich Zwinglis Sämtliche Werke, Band VIII*, Leipzig, 1914, p. 332.

6 *Op. cit.*, Band III, Leipzig, 1914, p. 872.

judgment that the issues involved concerned only unimportant things, but he certainly was right in denying that the issues concerned the inner aspect of Christian faith or experience. Grebel and his brethren were orthodox evangelical *Protestants*. If we take at face value Zwingli's statement that baptism and magistracy were the chief points at issue, we see that the deeper issues involved were those of the nature of the church and the relation of the Christian to the world.

Grebel's doctrine of the church was substantially that held by the modern nonconformist churches, particularly the Baptists and the Mennonites, and he was the first to hold this position. According to Grebel, the church as a local body comes into existence through the preaching of the Word, through the voluntary acceptance by men of this Word, and through the consequent conversion and renewal of life of individual believers. By faith the individual members are united together and incorporated into the body of Christ. This church is in truth a fellowship of brethren in life and suffering, a *communio sanctorum*, which is maintained by the inward bond of faith and the outward bond of love. When a member of the body fails to maintain love toward the brethren or does not order his life according to the gospel, he breaks the bond of fellowship and if he will not hear the church and repent and change his life he must be excluded from the fellowship of the believers. New members may be received into the church only upon a confession of faith and separation from sin, upon evidence of a renewal of life and a walk in holiness. All the government, ordinances, and activities of the church must be based solely upon the express teaching of the word of God or the example of Christ and the apostles, with the rigid exclusion of "opinions of men" (by which is meant a complete break with medieval tradition and a return to the apostolic pattern of the New Testament).

In the second major point, that of the relation of the Christian to the world order, Grebel and his followers occupy a unique position in the history of Protestant doctrine, a position which has not been followed by the nonconformist groups to any extent, and which probably only the modern Mennonites hold. Luther, Calvin, and Grebel alike condemned the world order as sinful and in need of regeneration, but the three assumed radically different attitudes toward the condemned

world order. Luther held that it was futile to do much to change it, and that since it was a necessary evil which one could not well escape, the Christian must compromise with it, participating as necessary in its life and institutions, and finding solace from the conflict by a retreat to the inner life with its experience of the grace of God and the forgiveness of sins. Calvin took the opposite position, namely, that the Christian must not compromise with the world, but must seek to regenerate the world order and make it Christian and thus make the will of God sovereign in all human life and institutions, even though that might mean the suppression by force of the ungodliness of the ungodly. Unfortunately, Calvin took from the Old Testament instead of from the New altogether too much of the content of the will of God, from which the pattern for human society was to be drawn, and in so doing compromised with the world unconsciously as Luther did deliberately. Grebel agreed with Calvin that the existing world order needed to be regenerated according to the will of God, but he differed in the method by which it was to be accomplished. He would separate the true Christian from the ungodly world order and its institutions, and resolutely abandon the use of the civil state even in its theocratic form to promote the Christianization of society, rather making the church a light to the world and a salt to the earth. The church should overcome the world by winning members from the ungodly society of the world to the godly society of the church.

According to Grebel, the church has no right to seek to rule society from without or to attempt to control the civil authorities for the benefit of its interests. Rather it should probably expect to continue to be a "suffering church" in the world, as Christ promised his disciples, and never expect the mass of men to enter its portals or to adopt its way of life. However, within the boundaries of the church the will of God as found in Christ and the gospel (not as found in the Old Testament which for Grebel was of inferior value and certainly no longer valid for the Christian) was to have absolute sway. No Calvinist ever taught more rigidly the absolute sovereignty of God over the life of the members of the Christian community than Conrad Grebel and his brethren did. He resolutely refused to make the deliberate compromise with the world which Luther (and possibly Zwingli) made, or the unconscious

compromise with the world which Calvin made. Reinhold Niebuhr has recently admonished those who still hold today this absolute uncompromising idealism to think that if it were not for the compromisers who endeavor to make this ungodly world order function after a fashion (all the while knowing that it cannot by any stretch of the imagination be called a Christian world order), and thus maintain a degree of law and order, existence would become intolerable, if not impossible, for the absolutists; thus the absolutists are in a sense parasites on the compromisers. Perhaps so, yet, as Niebuhr says in the same place, the absolutists render a service to the church by keeping alive the testimony to the supreme ideal as taught by Christ and pricking the consciences of the compromisers.

Grebel's absolutism did not make him a social revolutionary, although his program for the Christian was certainly radical for his time, and in fact is still radical for our day. He demanded absolute Christian non-resistance, the complete abandonment of the use of force and of the taking of human life. He was thus the first absolute Christian pacifist of modern times, except for Peter Chelčický of Bohemia, and most of his followers have maintained this principle to the present day. In taking this position, he found it necessary to deny the Christian the right to participate in the functions of the state, for the magistrates were compelled to use force and to take life, for the state is ultimately based upon the sanction of force. Again, Grebel repudiated for the Christian the oppressive and unjust economic practices of his day, completely rejected tithes and rents, and insisted upon the exercise of Christian brotherhood in economic relationships. It is not true, however, that his program included a communistic social order, although the emphasis upon genuine Christian brotherhood did lead to the establishment of pure Christian communism after a few years in one branch of the Anabaptist movement in Austria and Moravia, that known as "Hutterian Brethren."

Space will not permit going into further details of Grebel's theology or ethics. In conclusion, however, it should be said, that those who examine carefully his testimony will become convinced that Conrad Grebel sought after reality in the spiritual life, a reality that was far removed from any mere externalism or legalism. He sought to generate and maintain

a deep inner spiritual life through a living faith in Christ and a personal union with Him. He earnestly sought to make this inner spiritual life effective in the daily experience of the Christian believer; in trust in God for daily needs, in love toward the brethren, in separation from sin and the world, and in the life of holiness. He held that alone through incorporation with Christ and the brethren can the individual receive the strength necessary to live the Word of God, to conquer sin, and to maintain love. But by this strength, he and his martyr followers believed absolutely that the individual believer and the church as a whole would be able to bear victoriously "the baptism of temptation and testing," of persecution, suffering, and death, and "pass triumphantly through the testing by fire into the homeland of eternal rest."

NEW DOCUMENTS ON EARLY PROTESTANT RATIONALISM

ROLAND H. BAINTON

Yale University

The period of the Reformation is one in which the editing and publication of new documents may be expected to necessitate a periodic revision of the general works. In a sense this is true of every period, but the unpublished sources for the age of the New Testament are slight and not often does the investigator turn up a *Didache* or the *Odes of Solomon*. In the Reformation period, however, discoveries are frequent and critical editions incomplete for even the great figures like Luther and Calvin. Zwingli is still in process in the *Corpus Reformatorum*. Traugott Schiess did not live to finish Bullinger. Some ten years ago M. Aubert showed me at Geneva the materials for the correspondence of Beza, but so far as I have observed nothing has appeared. Thomas Müntzer was in luck with the publication of his letters by Boehmer and Kirn in 1931 and his works by Otto H. Brandt in 1933. The Anabaptists have been favored only with a beginning. The *Verein für Reformationsgeschichte* has brought out one large volume on Württemberg and a smaller one on Brandenburg, but eleven more are still in the loins of Abraham. The *Kommission zur Erforschung der Geschichte der Reformation und Gegenreformation* published the letters of Peutingen and Cuspius and selected works of Erasmus (edited by Annemarie and Hajo Holborn now of Yale), but further work on the humanists has been dropped. If only we might revive it in this country! Among us the *Corpus Schwenckfeldianorum* has been wallowing in the trough of foreign exchange. The fourteenth volume happily is out. Bender, Yoder and Correll have the material for a volume of Grebeliana if only the way opens to make friends with the mammon of unrighteousness.

With so many arrested or incomplete enterprises we rejoice that the Italians have succeeded in presenting us with a volume illustrating the intellectual left wing of the Reformation as represented chiefly by the Italian refugees. The indefatigable Can-

timori has assembled material from the archives of Switzerland, England and Poland. On discovering that the editing of Castellio's *De Arte Dubitandi* had already been undertaken by Miss Elizabeth Feist, then of Berlin, now a Sterling Fellow at Yale, he generously associated her with himself in the enterprise and thus made possible the publication of her work. The volume is entitled *Per la Storia degli Eretici Italiani del Secolo XVI in Europa*, Testi raccolti da D. Cantimori e E. Feist. (Roma: Reale Accademia d'Italia Studi e Documenti, VII. 1937. 432 pages.)

However careful the editing, new materials of this sort always call for discussion. Cantimori frankly contented himself simply with the presentation of an accurate text. The significance of the materials he has been discussing elsewhere in various articles to which I will call attention. Miss Feist has attempted to identify all references and has succeeded in the case of definite citations. In many instances, however, Castellio refers vaguely to the views of "certain ones." I will try to add something to the identification of sources and to the elucidation of the documents.

Castellio's work is concerned with the problem of religious liberty in relation to religious truth. The fate of the manuscript of the *De Arte Dubitandi* is indicative of the interests of different epochs. In the early seventeenth century a section was published dealing with justification by faith, and in the middle of the eighteenth century another bearing on biblical criticism. Not until now has the body of the work on religious epistemology seen the light. The age of the Reformation was altogether too sure of its affirmations to feel the need of systematic investigation of the problem of knowledge. Castellio, of course, was interested in the question from the religious point of view quite as much as his contemporaries. His concern was to reduce religious persecution by eliminating many of the subjects of controversy on the score of uncertainty. He had no mind whatever to demolish the whole structure of Christian belief, but merely to pare down to the minimal and assured fundamentals.

His initial attack was on Calvin's identification of faith and knowledge. And back of this lies a long history. In the late Middle Ages the so-called "Augustinians" took a position close to that of Calvin, for they believed that faith and knowledge are

not mutually exclusive.¹ The Occamists were at the other extreme, for they not only separated faith and knowledge but also faith and reason.² Aquinas was in between. Faith and knowledge are to be distinguished, but reason leads up to and illustrates faith. In the Protestant camp Luther's view was Occamism grown religiously vital. Faith was pitted even more violently against "the harlot reason", but faith was mightily sure of itself.³ Melancthon and Zwingli, while toning down Luther, still held to the essential irrationality of faith.⁴ Calvin with this background arrived at an accentuated "Augustinianism." Faith and knowledge are no longer different modes of apprehending the same object at the same time, but rather faith can be described as *agnitio*, *cognitio* and *scientia*,⁵ and all the more impregnable because bestowed by God and not achieved by man. The rôle of the "Augustinian" *illuminatio* is performed by the *testimonium spiritus sancti*. The rational natural theology of Aquinas is avoided, because the reason of man has been depraved by the fall, and likewise the inspired theology of the Anabaptists is eschewed as imperilling the revelation once and for all delivered in the Scriptures. The function of the Spirit is merely to illumine the Word.

Castellio desired to demolish Calvin's assurance on such points as predestination and the Trinity. The first attack was directed against the equation of faith and knowledge. There was a return here to the position of Aquinas. Next Castellio rejected

1 Hugo Lang, *Die Lehre des Hl. Thomas von Aquin von der Gewissheit des über-natürlichen Glaubens* (Augsburg, 1929), 5-9.

Karl Heim, *Das Gewissheitsproblem in der systematischen Theologie bis zu Schleiermacher* (Leipzig, 1911), 25.

Martin Grabmann, *Die philosophische und theologische Erkenntnislehre des Mathäus von Aquasparta* (Wien, 1906), 159ff. Theol. Studien der Leo-Gesellschaft XIV.

2 Nicola Abbagnano, *Guglielmo di Ockham* (Lanciano, 1931), 239.

Heinrich Denifle, *Luther und Luthertum* (Mainz, 1906), I, 609-611.

Carl Prantl, *Geschichte der Logik im Abendlande*, III und IV (Leipzig, 1867).

Karl Heim, "Zur Geschichte der Satz von der doppelte Wahrheit," aus *Studien zur systematischen Theologie, Theodor v. Haering zum 70 Geburtstag* (22. April, 1918) von Fachgenossen dargebracht (Tübingen, 1918), 14.

3 Denifle, *op. cit.* 639.

Jacques Maritain, *Three Reformers* (New York, 1928), 31-34.

4 On Melancthon, see Ernst Troeltsch, *Vernunft und Offenbarung bei Johann Gerhard und Melancthon* (Göttingen, 1891) and *Corpus Reformatorum*, XIII, 650. Cf. 151.

On Zwingli, see Wilhelm Thomas, *Das Erkenntnisprinzip bei Zwingli* (Diss. Leipzig, 1902) and *Huldreich Zwinglii Opera*, Schuler und Schulthess (Zürich, 1832), III, 491.

5 *Calvini Opera*, II, 399-410, *Instit.* III, ii, 2-14.

Peter Brunner, *Vom Glauben bei Calvin* (Tübingen, 1925). Chapter VI is devoted to Erkenntnis.

the view that faith is a gift of God. Here he was exaggerating the position of Aquinas that *accipere fidem est voluntatis*,⁶ and thereby unwittingly relinquishing a common basis for religious liberty. The radicals argued from the premise which runs from Augustine through Calvin that *fides* is a *donum Dei* to the conclusion that it must be beyond the jurisdiction of the sword of the magistrate. The declaration of liberty in Hungary in 1568 was based on just that ground.⁷ Castellio retrieved himself, however, by substituting for a determinism of faith a determinism of intellect. Reason is a gift of God and the mind can be convinced only by evidence and not by the sword of the magistrate.⁸

Calvin's whole picture of man was subject to attack. Castellio admitted that morally Adam fell down, but intellectually he fell up, for he ate of the tree of knowledge and his eyes were opened. The fall in no sense impaired the intellectual capacities of man.⁹

With regard to Scripture, Castellio demanded a rigorous biblical criticism and the recognition that the sacred writers sometimes recorded their own opinions rather than the mind of God. Some might feel that such an assumption would destroy the authority of Scripture. *Ad quod ego respondeo etiam, si ita esset, non idcirco non esse vera quae dixi.*¹⁰

Nevertheless, Castellio and Calvin were not so far apart in their view of Scripture. Calvin was no verbal literalist and was quite prepared to recognize error in Acts 7, 16 and Matthew 27, 9.¹¹ For that reason I suspect that Castellio had some one else in mind when he referred to those who think *Sacras enim literas esse divino afflatu conscriptas neque hominum, sed dei arbitrio aeditas, quarum si vel unum verbum in dubium vocetur, periculum sit, ne cadat earum autoritas.*¹² Now Calvin, as the editors note, would say that the Word of God must not be increased or diminished, but that is not to say that *unum verbum* must not be

6 S. Th. II, 2, Q.X, a.viii, *Opera Omnia* VIII, 89.

7 Friedrich Teutsch, *Geschichte der evangelischen Kirchen im Siebenbürgen*, 2 vols. Hermannstadt, 1921-22), I, 284.

8 *De Arte Dubitandi*, 380 and 350.

9 *Ibid.*, 367.

10 *Ibid.*, 340.

11 *Calvini Opera*, XLVIII, 138 and XLV, 749. Cf. Émile Doumergue, *Jean Calvin*, IV, 76-78.

Dunlop Moore, "Calvin's Doctrine of Holy Scripture," *Pres. and Ref. Review*, IV (1893).

Benjamin Warfield, "Calvin's Doctrine of the Knowledge of God," *Princeton Theol. Rev.*, VII (1909) reprinted in *Calvin and Calvinism* (Oxford Press, 1931).

12 *De Arte Dubitandi*, 337.

called in question. One thinks rather of a passage like this from Matthias Flacius Illyricus: *Singula ergo eius uerba tanti momenti esse apud nos debent, ut nobis coelo ac terra maiora esse uideantur*.¹³ But here again one is on controverted ground. Otto Ritschl hailed Flacius as the father of verbal inspiration.¹⁴ But Moldaenke has just stoutly contested this view,¹⁵ and opposes to a passage like the above the following statement of Flacius to Schwenckfeld: *das sey jm yetzt geantwort das vns nicht vmb die schriftt oder silben zuthun sey auch nicht vmb die stimm schal laut vnnnd buchstaben oder auch vmb die weyse zu reden sondern vmb die lehre meynung oder sentenz*. Can Flacius be harmonized with himself? I do not know. But Castellio might easily have had in mind a passage like the one given above.

The editors are at a loss to identify those who say *Fides est actio intellectus* (p.387). One thinks of Abelard who associated *intelligere* and *credere*. Again who are those who reduce the atonement to the influence of the precept and example of Christ? (p. 397). Abelard does not quite fit. For him the atonement was the divine love awakening a response in human love. One thinks rather of the general tone of Erasmus. He would never have denied the propitiatory death of Christ, but he laid the whole emphasis on precept and example. Under those who think that not God but man was reconciled the editors see a reference to Ochino and rightly, save that behind him lies a long development. He fuses the Scotist view that the propitiation must not be interpreted to conflict with the absolute independence of the divine will, and the Valdesian view that propitiation must not detract from the divine love, and the Neoplatonic view that anger in God conflicts with the divine impassibility.¹⁶

Castellio's own theory of knowledge is based on sense experience and reason. The testimony of the senses, after due correction for optical and other illusions, may be accepted as valid. Here Castellio is doing little more than elaborate the view of

13 *Fidelis Admonitio*, first ed., 1562, in the *Omnes Libelli Matthiae Fl. Illyrici* (Antwerp (?) 1567), 98.

14 *Dogmengeschichte des Protestantismus* (Leipzig, 1908), I, Kap. XI.

15 Günter Moldaenke, *Schriftverständnis und Schriftdeutung im Zeitalter der Reformation*, Teil 1, *Matthias Flacius Illyricus* (Stuttgart, 1936), *Forschungen z. Kirchen- und Geistesgeschichte*, IX.

16 The standard work on the history of the atonement is Albrecht Ritschl, *Die christliche Lehre von der Rechtfertigung und Versöhnung*, 2 vols. (Bonn, 1903). On Juan Valdés, see J. Heep, *Juan de Valdés* (Leipzig, 1909), *Quellen und Darstellungen aus der Geschichte des Reformationsjahrhunderts*, XI.

Cicero,¹⁷ and the whole picture of reason is a combination of the early patristic logos doctrine with Ciceronian strains.¹⁸ For this reason I cannot at all agree with Miss Feist that *Il concetto del dubbio del Castellio deriva dalla coscienza filosofica della soggettività di ogni pensiero. Per questo è in istretto rapporto col concetto cartesiano del dubbio*. An epistemology which starts off with the validity of sense experience is a long way from the *soggettività di ogni pensiero*. Castellio's doubt applies only to those theological dogmata for which adequate evidence is lacking. Doubt is not the point of departure for a theory of knowledge. The line runs from Castellio backward to Cicero and forward to Locke, whereas Descartes starts from Augustine's *Dubito ergo sum*.

Now let us turn to the larger body of documents edited by Cantinori. His plan has been to give an accurate rendering of the text with only a slight measure of critical apparatus. I will run through the collection indicating the content and importance of each document and the problems connected with it.

The first text is that of the *Dialogo Religioso*, anonymous and undated. The discussion of the benefit of Christ's death, indulgences, monastic vows and purgatory suggest the early days of the reform. Citations from the scholastics are frequent. One of the interlocutors, for some curious reason, consistently uses an Italian dialect different from the speech of the others. Criticism independent of Valla is directed against the historicity of the *Donatio Constantini*.

The tract by Camillo Renato is an attack on infant baptism. Strictly speaking the position is not Anabaptist since there is no plea for re-baptism. But, for that matter, the Anabaptists did not admit that the baptism of those previously baptized in infancy constituted a repetition since the dipping of infants was no baptism at all. The rationalist character of Italian "Anabaptism" appears in that the ground for adult baptism is not the new birth but an assured faith.

Two works of Lelio Socinus are published, his "Theses on the Trinity" and his comments on the Johannine Prologue. Both

17 Cf. Castellio, *op. cit.*, 371 with *Ciceronis Academicorum Priorum liber secundus, qui inscribitur Lucullus*, cap. VII.

See Ludwig Stein, *Die Erkenntnislehre der Stoa*. (Berlin, 1888), *Berliner Studien für klassische Philologie und Archeologie*, VII, 1.

18 Justin Martyr, Migne, PG, VI, 397, 465.

Cicero *De Legibus*, II, iv, 9-10; *De Finibus*, II, xii, 37; *De Natura Deorum*, II, xii.

call for lengthy discussion as to their authenticity as works of Lelio. The introduction is able to treat the subject only with extreme brevity, but the lack is made up in an article by Cantimori, "Gli ultimi anni e gli ultimi scritti di Lelio Sozzini" (*Religio*, XII, No. 6, 1936). The article contains also a discussion of Lelio's share in the composition of the *De Haereticis Coercendis* (1554), commonly attributed to Castellio. Cantimori would go further than I have done in attributing to Lelio the plan and the collection of some of the material. I am not prepared to contest the possibility. One simply cannot tell. More convincing is the attribution to Lelio on grounds of handwriting of the *Apologia Alfonsi Lingurii Tarraconensis hispani pro Serveto*.¹⁹

The next documents are connected with the flight of Matteo Gribaldi Mofa from Tübingen, a subject already treated by Cantimori in the article "Matteo Gribaldi Mofa Chierese e l'Università di Tubinga" (*Bollettino Storico-Bibliografico Subalpino*, XXXV, No. 5-6, 1933). Celio Secondo Curione of Basel was involved in difficulties because of his relations with Gribaldi. A review is given in the book of a document bearing on his expurgation at Basel.

Giorgio Blandrata comes next. The accompanying article in his case is Cantimori's "Profilo di Giorgio Blandrata Saluzzese" (*Bollettino Storico-Bibliografico Subalpino*, XXXVIII, No. 3-4, 1936). None of the texts published in the book illustrates better than this tract of Blandrata the importance of the embedded sources and the desirability of identifying them. On page 107 there is a reference to the book of Joachim of Fiore accusing the Lombard of making the Trinity into a quaternity. The ideas of Joachim can be studied in a work by his disciples recently recovered and published by Carmelo Ottaviano, "Joachimi Abbatis Liber contra Lombardum" (Scuola di Giacchino da Fiore), *Studi e Documenti*, 3, Reale Accademia d'Italia (Roma, 1934). Next in Blandrata's work we have mention of the condemnation of Joachim's book in *capite Damnamus*. The reference is to the decretal of Innocent III in *Corpus Juris Canonici* Lib. 1, tit. i, *De Summa Trinitate*, cap. ii, *Damnamus*. On the next page Blandrata cites, among others, *Robertus Olchot in primo Sententiarum distinctione* 5. The passage intended is Robert Holcot *Super quatuor libros Sententiarum*, 1, *quaest.* 5. Next we read *Vide quoque et Ioannem maioris in primo Sententiarum*, *dis-*

¹⁹ *Calvini Opera*, XV, 239 f.

inctione, 4. The reference is to *Joannes Major Scotus in primum Sententiarum, Dist. 4 et 5, q. 6*. Next comes *Vide et Petrum de Aliaco libro 1, quaestione 5*. This is Pierre D'Ailly, *Quaestiones magistri Petri de Alliaco . . . super primum tertium et quartum Sententiarum Lib. 1, Quaest. 5*.

The location of these passages has something more than academic interest, because they are all to be found in the *De Trinitatis Erroribus* of Michael Servetus, from whom I suspect Blandrata derived them, for he speaks on the next page of *Michael Servetus vir eruditus*.

The presence of these passages both in Servetus and Blandrata throws significant light on a controverted point with regard to the continuity of Antitrinitarian thought. Adolph Harnack²⁰ contended that the Nominalist school directed against the doctrine of the Trinity a subversive criticism which was prevented from full fruition by the authority of the church always in reserve, but when that authority was extinguished by humanism the critique came into its own. And the man who exemplified this outcome was Michael Servetus. Dunin Borkowski attacked this view²¹, contending in the first place that the Nominalists had no mind to be subversive and in the second that the Antitrinitarians of the sixteenth century had no direct acquaintance with the scholastics. "*Um eine Abhängigkeit wissenschaftlich zu erweisen, genügt es nicht, ideengeschichtliche Zusammenhänge in einer möglichen and wahrscheinlichen Ordnung zu entdecken, man müsste sie im Schriftum der Unitarier genau nachweisen, man müsste die scotistischen and terministischen Werke einzeln anführen, aus denen sichtbar geschöpft wurde*." I do not see how the learned Jesuit could have written this, if he had taken the trouble to look in the very place to which Harnack pointed, namely Michael Servetus. This is not so say that Harnack's picture of Servetus is adequate, nor did he identify the passages demanded by Dunin Borkowski. But they are there and have been located by E. Morse Wilbur in his excellent translation and edition, *The Two Treatises of Servetus on the Trin-*

20 *Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte* (Freiburg i.B., 1890), III, 659. This is the second edition. The statement is fuller than in the sixth with which alone I have been able to compare it.

21 Stanislas Dunin Borkowski, *75 Jahre Stella Matutina Festschrift* (Feldkirch, 1931), Bd. I, "Quellenstudien zur vorgeschichte der Unitarier des 16. Jahrhunderts", 91-138. Bd. II, "Untersuchungen zum Schriftum der Unitarier vor Faustus Socino", pp. 103-147. On the particular point Bd. I, pp. 135-37. The Library of Congress enters this work under Feldkirch, Austria.

ity, (Harvard Theological Studies, XVI, Cambridge, Mass., 1932). The presence of the citations from the Nominalists at first hand by Servetus and probably though not necessarily, at second hand by Blandrata, is a sufficient witness of the continuity of thought from the *Moderni* to the Antitrinitarians.

There is more evidence too. Servetus has a further citation which eluded Wilbur and Blandrata,²² a reference to another of the *Moderni*, namely Gregory of Rimini, *Lectura Sententiarum* 1 Sent., Dist. XIII.²³ Servetus also used Occam, *Quaestiones et Decisiones*, Dist. 26²⁴. Dunin Borkowski's attempt to exonerate late scholasticism from a share in the responsibility for Protestant Antitrinitarianism does not stand examination.

Blandrata is followed in the collection by Francesco Pucci, who came over to the Reform through revulsion against the massacre of St. Bartholomew, but was disillusioned by the intolerance of the Reformers and returned to Rome. Cantimori has given an account of him in the *Enciclopedia Italiana*.

The next document, entitled *Forma d'una Repubblica Catholica*, is anonymous. The general plan is that advocated by Acontius of reducing Christianity to those minimal and common terms on which agreement would be possible between Greek and Latin, Papist and Protestant, Armenian, Ethiopian, and Indian.

The final documents are connected with Faustus Socinus in Poland and are of interest for social as well as religious history. Cantimori was indebted for the discovery of this material to the outstanding scholar of the Polish Reformation, Stanislas Kot. For the understanding of the documents one should consult Kot's *Ideologia Politycznai i Spoleczna Braci Polskich zwanych Arjanami* (Warsaw, 1932). The substance of this work in condensed form was incorporated in his *Le Mouvement Antitrinitaire au XVIe et au XVIIe siècle* (Paris, 1937).

²² *De Trinitatis Erroribus*, 39b. Wilbur *op. cit.*, 61, thought it a mistake for Augustine. The reference to Gregory is blind, but the clue to the solution appears in Servetus' *Restitutio*, 41.

²³ Edition of Paris, 1482, sig. 84. Copy in the John Carter Brown library, Providence R. I.

²⁴ *De Trinitatis Erroribus*, 42a, Wilbur, *op. cit.*, 66.

MINUTES OF THE FOURTEENTH SPRING MEETING OF THE SOCIETY

April 29-30, 1938

The American Society of Church History held its spring meeting jointly with the Mississippi Valley Historical Association at Butler University and the Claypool Hotel at Indianapolis, Indiana, on April 29 and 30, 1938.

At the opening session on the afternoon of April 29 twenty-two members were present, besides a number of visitors. Vice-President Charles Lyttle presided. The meeting was opened with prayer by Professor Bruce Kershner.

The first paper, by Raymond P. Stearns of the University of Illinois was on *The English Congregational Classis in Holland, 1621-1635*. After an animated discussion, it was followed by a paper, by Massey H. Shepherd Jr. of the Divinity School of the University of Chicago, on *The Anthropomorphic Controversy in the Time of Theophilus of Alexandria*. The last paper of the session was by Maurice C. Latta of Olivet College, on *American Christianity and the Beginnings of American Imperialism*. It was extensively commented upon.

The banquet was held in the Empire Room of the Claypool Hotel, Dean Frederick C. Kershner acting as toastmaster. He introduced the guest speaker, President James William Putnam of Butler University, who greeted the society in behalf of his institution.

The Society reassembled at eight o'clock in the Empire Room of the Claypool Hotel. A paper was read by Pres. C. J. I. Bergendoff of Augustana College and Theological Seminary on *The Swedish Colony on the Delaware*.

At the business session which followed, the minutes of the meeting of May 7-8, 1937 were approved as published in the June 1937 issue of *Church History*. Thereupon the secretary reported the actions taken by the Council. The report comprised the list of deceased members, the members who had resigned, and the election of new members. The secretary furthermore re-

ported that a bequest of ten thousand dollars (\$10,000) had been left to the Society by our former member, Frank S. Brewer, and the appropriate action regarding the bequest taken by the Council.

It was voted that the spring 1939 meeting be held either in conjunction with the Mississippi Valley Historical Association at Memphis, Tennessee, or at the Chicago Theological Seminary. The decision was referred to the officers with power.

It was voted that the action regarding the place of the meeting of December, 1938, taken by the Society in its meeting at Chester, Pennsylvania, on December 29, 1937, (*Church History*, March, 1938, p. 68) be reconsidered.

The Society voted that the December, 1938, meeting be held in connection with the American Historical Association in Chicago. Arrangements for the meeting were left in the hands of the Program Committee.

William Warren Sweet read a report of the work of the Research Committee, which was adopted.

It was furthermore voted in this connection that Pierce Butler be authorized to communicate with the historiographer of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States in order to secure permission to photostat the historical documents bearing on American church history found in Lambeth and Fulham palaces in London.

The Nominating Committee, consisting of Shirley Jackson Case, M. M. Knappen, J. M. Batten, and W. W. Sweet, recommended that Professor Sweet be reappointed chairman of the Research Committee and be authorized to select the members of that committee. The recommendation was adopted. The research committee for the coming year is composed of the following members: William Warren Sweet, Chairman; C. E. Schneider, M. M. Deems, R. E. E. Harkness, C. H. Moehlman, J. M. Batten, R. H. Johnson, F. D. Kershner, T. C. Pears Jr., E. T. Thompson, S. M. Tenney, C. A. Hawley.

Thereupon a vote was taken expressive of the society's sincere appreciation to President James William Putnam and Dean Frederick C. Kershner for their kind hospitality.

The Saturday morning session, on April 30, was held at 10:00 o'clock in the Assembly Hall of the Claypool Hotel. The

first paper was read by J. M. Batten of Scarritt College for Christian Workers, on *Henry M. Turner: Negro Bishop Extraordinary*. For lack of time it could not be discussed adequately. It was followed by a paper by W. W. Sweet of the Divinity School of the University of Chicago, on *The Cultural and Educational Influence of the Frontier Churches*. The last paper was read by R. D. Leonard of Beloit College, on *Stephen Peet and the Agency of the American Home Missionary Society in Wisconsin*. This was a joint session with the Mississippi Valley Historical Association and a number of members of that organization were present.

At the business session which followed, the vice-president appointed the following as members of the Program Committee: Wilhelm Pauck, Chairman; Walter C. Gibbs, and Massey H. Shepherd Jr.

It was furthermore voted to reconsider the action regarding the place of the next spring meeting of the Society and the matter was left in the hands of the Program Committee with power.

The meeting was thereupon adjourned.

Attest: MATTHEW SPINKA, *Secretary*.

MEETING OF THE COUNCIL OF THE SOCIETY

April 29, 1938

In accordance with the call of President Reuben E. E. Harkness, the Council of the American Society of Church History met on Friday evening, April 29, 1938, in the Empire Room of the Claypool Hotel, Indianapolis, Indiana. The following members were present: Charles Lyttle, W. W. Sweet, Wilhelm Pauck, John McNeill, and Matthew Spinka.

The minutes of the meeting of the council on May 7, 1937, were approved as published in the June issue of *Church History*.

The Secretary reported that the following members had died since the last meeting of the Council: Patrick J. Healy, C. J. Ramage, Kerr Duncan Macmillan, Frank S. B. Gavin, and John S. Cornett.

The secretary reported the resignations of the following members, which were accepted: Carl Conrad Eckhardt, S. F. Maine, Francis R. Taylor, Walter B. Posey, and Edmund A. Moore.

The following candidates were elected to membership in the society, subject to the fulfilment of the constitutional requirements concerning membership:

Prof. C. Howard Hopkins, Mt. Hermon School, Mt. Hermon, Massachusetts

John Knox, *Christendom*, 440 South Dearborn St., Chicago, Illinois.

Rev. John W. Christie, D.D., 1304 Delaware Ave., Wilmington, Delaware.

The Rev. M. T. Y. Hanun, S.T.B., J.D., 2019 Charleston St., Chicago, Illinois.

Dr. Bliss Washington Billings, 99 Claremont Ave., New York City.

Prof. C. E. Van Sickle, Ohio Wesleyan University, Delaware, Ohio.

Rev. William Chalmers Covert, D.D., 6445 Green Street,
Germantown, Philadelphia, Penna.

Prof. E. M. Violette, University of Louisiana, Baton Rouge, La.

Prof. Guy F. Hershberger, Goshen College, Goshen, Ind.

The secretary reported to the Council the terms of the bequest of the will of Frank S. Brewer of Glen Ellyn, Illinois. It was voted to accept the bequest and the terms under which it was made. The pertinent section of the will is as follows:

"Article 5. I give and bequeath to the American Society of Church History, a corporation of the State of New York having an executive office in the City of Chicago, Illinois, the sum of Ten Thousand Dollars (\$10,000) in Trust, the income thereof to be used for printing such publications as may be ordered by said society, preference being given to the publication of books and pamphlets having to do with Congregational History.

"All of said publications to have a suitable inscription on front or title page recognizing the Frank S. and Elizabeth D. Brewer Fund for Printing."

It was furthermore voted that Robert Hastings Nichols, Treasurer of the American Society of Church History, be authorized to receive the bequest.

It was voted to accept the resignation of Robert Hastings Nichols as chairman of the Committee on Investments. By a vote, Shirley Jackson Case was appointed chairman on behalf of the Committee.

On Dean Case's recommendation on behalf of the Committee on Investments, it was voted that the sum of (\$10,000) Ten Thousand Dollars, to be received from the Frank S. Brewer bequest, be invested by the Harris Trust and Savings Bank, of Chicago, Illinois, in government bonds and remain in custody of the said bank, the income to be paid to the treasurer of the society.

It was voted to reconsider the vote taken by the Society in its meeting of December 29, 1937, regarding the place of the December, 1938 meeting (see *Church History*, March 1938, p. 68).

It was voted that the Council recommend to the Society

that the December, 1938 meeting be held in connection with the American Historical Association in Chicago, Illinois.

Voted that the Council recommend to the Society that the spring, 1939 meeting be held either jointly with the Mississippi Valley Historical Association at Memphis, Tennessee, or at the Chicago Theological Seminary.

Voted that the decision be referred to the officers with power to act.

Adjourned.

Attest: MATTHEW SPINKA, *Secretary*.

BOOK REVIEWS

NEW CHAPTERS IN NEW TESTAMENT STUDY

By EDGAR JOHNSON GOODSPEED. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1937. 223 pages. \$2.00.

A volume of lectures, covering a number of individual subjects, does not always have a unity of theme. *New Chapters in New Testament Study* has a unifying base in the consideration of most of its particular elements. It makes the volume noteworthy for the special interests of the student of the history of Christianity. This unifying base is a striking statement of the effect of Ephesian developments in early Christianity. The judgment may be hazarded that Professor Goodspeed's discovery of the importance of Ephesus in early Christianity will take its place with his famous American translation of the New Testament, his contributions to theories of gospel sources, and his brilliant work in New Testament introduction as important results of biblical research. This suggests something of the value of the present work.

This volume is a conspicuous example of humanistic research at its best. Professor Goodspeed's hypothesis of the collection and publication of Paul's letters, with its constituent theory of the origin of the so-called Epistle to the Ephesians, is based upon a thorough study of the conventions of "book making" and publication in antiquity. In a unique way, this further integrates early Christianity in ancient society, no less than well-known studies of Christianity and contemporary religions. Much of ancient life and culture is learned in this approach. The effects of what was an important event in Christianity's development are shown in a consideration of techniques of the study of New Testament introduction. From this point it is a natural transition to the study of translation, the original language of the New Testament, and such related themes as pseudonymity and "modern apocrypha." The final chapter is a valuable supplement to Dr. Goodspeed's *Strange New Gospels*.

Only a careful reading of *New Chapters in New Testament Study* suffices to show to the student the exacting and abundant scholarship which is back of the book. It is one of Dr. Goodspeed's most important works. It deserves wide reading and serious use.

The University of Chicago.

Donald Wayne Riddle.

FIRST CENTURY CHRISTIANITY

By J. C. WAND. Oxford: University Press, 1937. 172 pages. \$2.25.

This is not a work of narrative history. It is an attempt to describe the genius of early Christianity along several lines of its self-expression. The author has been particularly successful in conveying the impression

of creative vigor which marked the early movement. In contrast with so much study of external formative influences that we have had recently, an analysis of the church's own power of initiative is most welcome. The chapter headings appropriately use the adjective "new" with each subject—the Messiah, the life, the ethic, the faith, the organization, the intellectual freedom. Particularly in life and ethics this creative feature is convincingly portrayed, though the author does well to urge also the variety of intellectual content of the New Testament in contrast with the common over-emphasis on Pauline influence.

Lectures delivered by the archbishop of Brisbane in Melbourne Cathedral can hardly be expected to be free from some ecclesiastical bias. While he admits that no modern church exhibits primitive Christianity in its purity and argues as tolerantly as he can for reunion, the author evidently as a historian assumes that baptism was not merely primitive but also a rite of initiation and admission, that primitive worship required some definite human "conductor" (p. 109), and that episcopal organization was universal because "the only certain evidence we have points to the existence of no other established ministry" (p. 112). The original lectures each ended with what the author regarded as the bearing of the primitive picture upon the modern problem of "reunion." These conclusions now form an appendix, thus leaving the historical part separate. As a fresh and sincere portraiture of the nature of the early dynamic movement the main work can be quite generally recommended.

Harvard University.

Henry J. Cadbury.

THE CONTACT OF PHARISAISM WITH OTHER CULTURES

Edited by H. LOWE. London: The Sheldon Press, 1938. xxii, 371 pages. \$6.00.

This is the second volume of the series *Judaism and Christianity*, in which Jewish and Christian scholars are co-operating. The previous volume dealt with Judaism as it influenced New Testament thought, and the story is now continued to the period of the Reformation. Several chapters are devoted to Judaism under the Roman empire; one to its interaction with Islam; an important closing chapter is on the subjects of "Casuistry," as practised by Jewish and Christian moralists. All the writers are experts in their particular fields, and gather up in simple and intelligible form the results of much recondite investigation. They have kept two principal aims before them: to show that Judaism since biblical times has continually developed, adapting itself with marvellous flexibility to the needs of changing cultures; and to trace the effects of Jewish thought and practice in the moulding of Western civilization. It is commonly assumed that after the New Testament period Judaism went its own way and contributed nothing to the main stream of the world's life. This, it is shown, is a misconception. The Jewish influence has worked for the most part along hidden channels, but it has never ceased to affect law, theology, scholarship, social and economic activity. In the Middle Ages, more especially, it was Jewish thinkers who gave the chief impulse to the intellectual life of the

West. One cannot but feel that in some of these chapters the Jewish influence has been unduly emphasized, but the writers have done a real service by their clear presentation of one factor in European culture which has too often been neglected.

Union Theological Seminary, New York City.

E. F. Scott.

THE ENGLISH MISSIONARIES IN SWEDEN AND FINLAND

By C. J. A. OPPERMAN. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1937. xxiii, 221 pages. \$4.50.

The story of the Christianization of Sweden and Finland should be an attractive one to an English writer, for it is largely a story whose main characters are Englishmen. Yet in the ten pages of titles used by this author there are few works by English writers. The truth is that little has been written in English of first rate importance on the history, either early or later, of the Swedish church. Only in our own day is this defect being remedied. And here is an authoritative study, published by the English Church Historical Society, which should be read by anyone desirous of a scholarly treatment of the beginnings of Christianity in Sweden and Finland.

The author does not restrict himself to the English missionaries, but tells their story in the larger framework of the history of the Swedish church from its beginning in the ninth century to the Council of Skeninge in the middle of the thirteenth. The first missionary was not English. Ansgar came from New Corbey in Westphalia and his mission at Birka was under the jurisdiction of Hamburg. But this initial attempt did not enjoy great success, and hardly maintained itself, led alone influence surrounding regions. The English missionaries came in the eleventh century, mainly to central Sweden. But even the life and works of Sigfrid, Eskil, David, and their helpers did not achieve the conversion of the country as a whole. A papal document of 1120 mentions six sees in Sweden, but they were hardly more than centers of missionary work. In 1138—eight hundred years ago—the old heathen temple at Uppsala was torn down and material from it entered into the new Christian cathedral. A few years later the Cistercians gained a foothold and in 1152 the papal legate, an Englishman, Nicholas Breakspear, later to be known as Pope Adrian IV, secured closer allegiance to Rome. A dozen years later, in 1164, still another Englishman, the monk Stephen, became the first Swedish archbishop, with Uppsala as center. By the end of the twelfth century the country had become at least nominally christianized and romanized, though Swedish independence asserted itself against the new laws and the new authorities. Two Englishmen, Henry the Apostle, and Thomas, the bishop of Finland, figure in the conversion of the Finns which followed that of Sweden.

Dr. Oppermann in the course of two hundred pages has given us almost nine hundred foot-notes, indicating the carefulness of his research. Yet in a monograph which apparently is intended neither by its form or price to be popular, we would have appreciated a more critical treatment of the sources. Sagas, medieval annals, lives of saints, are not

always trustworthy. When at best the resultant picture is vague and often in details self-contradictory, and the leading scholars vary widely on important dates, a discussion of the value of the sources might make the picture clearer if only by elimination of some details. Prior to the twelfth century, there are hardly a dozen personages and dates in the history of the Swedish missions on which we can take firm hold. This study has brought together much that concerns this period, but we are still in the dark concerning the reasons for the slow and late conversion of the land. On the other hand, what we do know makes us thankful to the English church, for out of that church came the missionaries, monks, bishops, and administrators who laid the foundation of the church in Sweden and Finland.

It will be of interest to compare the present work with the volume of the new Swedish church history series which will deal with the missionary period. Though not yet in print, the book will present the mature labors of Prof. Knut Westman of Uppsala, and in it we may expect the most authoritative treatment yet given the early centuries of the church in Sweden.

Augustana Theological Seminary,
Rock Island, Ill.

Conrad Bergendoff.

A VALIANT BISHOP AGAINST A RUTHLESS KING;
THE LIFE OF ST. JOHN FISHER

By PAUL McCANN, St. Louis, Mo.; B. Herder Book Co., 1938. 227 pages.
\$2.50.

This is a well written life of Bishop Fisher, sufficiently detailed to give a fair picture of a truly great and good man, though it is very far from being "a complete story of the break up of Christendom in the sixteenth century". The author writes in a simple and attractive style and though the book distinctly belongs to a class of literature—hagiology—which has no high reputation, he succeeds in avoiding what renders such books intolerable to most readers. There are very many long extracts and speeches and contemporaneous documents, yet there are no references whereby they can be checked and their value appraised. This is unfortunate, as the omission renders the book less valuable and the references need not have given the appearance of pedantry. In fact, they would have carried conviction. What makes it especially unfortunate is that there are certain passages which have the marks of pure imagination, slight to be sure, but not appropriate to such a work, and casting doubt upon other passages, and also some apparent contradictions in the statements, although it should be said in only minor details. The account of the divorce of Queen Catherine is given with care and restraint, quite without the customary vituperations. The closing scene of Fisher's life is well and movingly related. There are a few historical slips: *e. g.*, Luther did not translate the Latin New Testament (p. 95)) but the Greek; Westminster Cathedral (p. 106) is evidently Westminster Abbey, which was not a cathedral until 1539, and then only a few years. The book is provided with good illustrations, nearly all from contemporaneous sources, as well

as views and plans of Cambridge associated with Fisher. But unfortunately, there seems to be complete neglect of Rochester, the city of which Fisher was bishop.

Protestant Episcopal Divinity School,
Philadelphia, Pa.

Joseph Cullen Ayer.

ULRICH VON HUTTEN AND THE GERMAN REFORMATION

By HAJO HOLBORN. Translated by Roland H. Bainton. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1937. vii, 214 pages. \$3.

Professor Holborn's biography of Hutten attained high rank at once on its publication in Germany in 1929. For this book he and Professor Bainton have collaborated "to achieve a better garment for the ideas" with such skill that the text rarely gives the impression of the Englishing of German. In general it reads like immediate writing, idiomatic and spirited. For the translation, the author says, the German was revised in the light of further study and enlarged, especially "in the sections dealing with Erasmus, with Hutten's life from 1521 to 1523, and with his literary significance." A review of Hutten research has been reduced to part of a bibliographical note. Even in its abbreviation this history from Herder and Goethe through D. F. Strauss to very recent times shows how much Hutten has meant to Germans and how ardently they have studied him.

Readers confined to English have not had the large opportunities to know Hutten which have been offered in German. Here his short crowded intense career is narrated vividly and with sympathetic understanding of character. The author has found him a rarely congenial biographical subject, because in him "conscious effort to realize a personality . . . appears first in German history." "He is the first German to achieve free and open expression for . . . a marked individuality." Does he really in this latter respect excel Luther, his senior by five years? Hutten's writings are skillfully used by Professor Holborn to yield autobiographical insights. The whole treatment of his literary work much enlarges his significance, compared to what has been the conventional estimate of him. Particularly interesting is the study of his part in the *Letters of Obscure Men*.

But much more is given here than biography. In a comparatively few pages the reader is taken into the heart of the life of the times. "Humanism, nationalism and Protestantism in the Germany of the Reformation constitute the real theme of this book." Hutten is taken as the best illustration of the working together of these three. The list would be long of the portions of German history, political, intellectual, religious, from 1510 to 1523 which are here illuminated: the ideals and purposes of the humanists, their efforts for German emancipation, the widespread general opposition to Rome, the condition and significance of Hutten's social class of the knights, his exaltation of the ancient German character, inspired chiefly by Tacitus' conception of Arminius—"the restoration of Christian piety and of primitive German manliness went hand in hand for Hutten"—Luther's relation to humanism and his and Hutten's controversy

with Erasmus, Luther's religious appeal to Germans, Luther at Worms as the center of contending forces in Germany and his support there from Hutten and Sickingen, Hutten's futile "war on the Romanists," *et multa alia*. The period is new after this book is studied. The six valuable illustrations and the admirable printing must be noticed.

Auburn Theological Seminary.

Robert Hastings Nichols.

MENNO SIMONS

By CORNELIUS KRAHN. Karlsruhe i. b., 1936. 192 pages.

The Mennonites and the Schwenckfelders are doing some of the best work in this country in Reformation history. No other groups have been so active of late in the publication of documents and the conduct of an historical journal. The point of view until recently has been apologetic, but of late the defensive tone has given way to scientific detachment. Dr. Krahn has this spirit.

Many interesting points are discussed in his book. First, there is eschatology. He recognizes, of course, that all of the Protestant reformers were eschatologists. The difference between Luther and the Anabaptists at this point was only as to the centrality of the concept. A more important difference developed among the Anabaptists themselves. The Melchiorites (the followers of Melchior Hofmann) held that the judgment would be executed by Christ. Believers should bear the cross. The Münsterites held that the kingdom is introduced by the execution of judgment at the hands of the faithful. The observation is sound and the transition from the one type to the other is not isolated. Thomas Münzer had already leapt from quietism to revolution over the bridge of eschatology, and had even attempted to reconcile the two by saying that Elijah was quietistic inwardly while outwardly slaughtering the priests of Baal. For further instances and for the whole background one might start with the entire eschatological ferment inaugurated by Joachim of Fiore.

The attempt of Menno to restore primitive Christianity places him in the line which runs from the Franciscans through Erasmus and Zwingli. All of the reformers, of course, in a measure were concerned for the restoration of primitive Christianity, but when the Anabaptists pushed the principle to the extent of repudiating the state connection, the reformers of the established churches recoiled. The ideal of the *Restitutio* passed to the Anabaptists and the term was used as a title for a number of their tracts. Calvin contented himself with the *Institutio*.

Menno's view of the inadequacy of outward sacraments was closer to that of Denck and Joris and the men of the inward word than I had supposed. Menno's great concern for the church without "spot and fleck" was characteristic of the whole Anabaptist movement and of all Puritan sects. With regard to the legitimacy of bearing arms he was not so clear as his followers became.

Yale Divinity School.

Roland H. Bainton.

DE. S. LAURENTII A BRUNDUSIO O. M. CAP.
 ACTIVITATE APOSTOLICA AC OPERIBUS TESTIMONIORUM
 ELENCHUS

By HIERONYMUS A FELLETTE, O. M. CAP. Venetiis: Typograph. S. Marci,
 1937. xxxvi, xxiv, 309 pages.

The subject of this dissertation exerted in his days a decided influence on the course of European politics. Born July 22, 1559, at Brindisi, he entered the Capuchin Order on February 18, 1575, and exercised an extensive activity as preacher in various cities of Italy and Switzerland up to 1599. For six years he was employed as preacher to the Jews, and in this capacity had to deliver his sermons in Hebrew. From 1599 to 1602 he labored in Austria, accompanied the imperial army as chaplain in 1601, and by his courageous behavior contributed materially to the victory over the Turks at Stuhlweissenburg (October 9-14). During the years 1602 to 1605, he governed the Capuchin Order in the quality of the supreme head or General, and visited the monasteries in Italy, Switzerland, France, and Belgium. In April, 1606, he was sent back to Prague, where he gained great renown as preacher. In 1609 he was chosen by the Catholic princes of Germany as their ambassador to the Spanish king. He left Prague in June, 1609, to go to Madrid and on the expiration of his diplomatic mission at the Spanish court (Dec. 12, 1609), he returned to Prague. But the next year he was sent to Munich, to act there in the twofold distinction of papal nuncio and Spanish ambassador at that court during two years. From 1613 till 1618 he lived in Italy, where he preached at many places and repeatedly made peace between quarreling princes. On October 3, 1618, he was chosen as agent of the citizens of Naples to the Spanish king, to receive redress from the oppression of the Viceroy Ossuna. On May 25, 1619, he pleaded their cause before the king at Lisbon, and four weeks later he died (July 22, 1619) there in the residence of the Marquis de Villafranca.

The diplomatic services rendered by this humble Capuchin to the Catholic cause were so considerable that the Duke of Bavaria declared that "all Germany and all Christendom owes him an eternal debt of gratitude because through him was established the Catholic League." His literary merits have been revealed by the publication of his works only within the last few years. Chief among them are: *Lutheranismi hypotyposis* (2 vols., Padua, 1930-1931), and *Hypotyposis Polycarpi Laiseri* (Padua, 1933), which are based on a large number of Lutheran works used in their original texts. His prodigious memory and close studies enabled the author to master ten languages: Latin, Greek, Hebrew, Aramaic, and Syriac, besides French, German, Spanish, Slavic and Albanian, not counting his mother tongue, Italian. Regarding his knowledge of Hebrew displayed in his polemical and exegetical works, Rabbi Umberto Cassuto states that it "was exceptionally profound and that he was not only familiar with the Hebrew text of the Old Testament and the Targumim but also with the Hebrew commentaries of the Middle Ages which he quotes very frequently and even in the most difficult passages with masterful exactness."

The present book gives a survey of his activity and literary works

with a complete bibliography of manuscript and printed sources, followed by long lists of testimonies of eminent men as to his extraordinary qualities and merits. The data about his diplomatic activity, however, are rather meagre. At any rate, the present work is a most helpful guide to scholars who are studying the career of this Capuchin and his influence during the time of the Counter-Reformation.

Pittsburgh, Pa.

J. M. Lenhart, O. M. Cap.

MANUDUCTIO AD MINISTERIUM
DIRECTIONS FOR A CANDIDATE OF THE MINISTRY

By COTTON MATHER. Bibliographical Note by Thomas J. Holmes and Kenneth B. Murdock. New York: Columbia University Press, 1938. [xi], xix, 151 pages. \$2.00.

To review in 1938 a book that was first published in 1726 is an interesting task. A facsimile reproduction of such a work suggests not only rarity, but also intrinsic merit; and a book such as the one now under review, if only because it was chosen for reproduction from the works of a man whose bibliography numbers more than four hundred titles, should pique the curiosity of any student of history.

Although less significant than his *Magnalia Christi Americana*, Cotton Mather's *Manuductio ad Ministerium* is nevertheless an important book: important despite the fact that Parrington does not mention it in his appraisal of the "Mather dynasty." It is important because of the practical use made of it in the eighteenth century, and it is also important because it is an essential source of the intellectual history of colonial America. The rarity of the original edition is indicated by the fact that Dr. Mary Latimer Gambrell, in the bibliography accompanying her *Ministerial Training in Eighteenth-Century New England* (New York, 1937), lists only the reprint of 1789.

The *Manuductio ad Ministerium* (a title doubtless suggested by Wollebius's *Manuductio ad Theologiam*) was published near the end of Cotton Mather's life. We know that as early as 1742 Mather was determined to bring out such a work. After the death of President Leverett, he hoped to be elected president of Harvard College; but the Corporation passed him by. Wounded in spirit, he turned to his diary and therein, under date of August 13, recorded his chagrin in these words: "Hasten, hasten, O slothful Mather; in dispatching thy Treatise of Advice to the Candidates of the Ministry, thou mayst thereby do more Good, than twenty Presidents of Colledges!" Two years later the *Manuductio* issued from the press in Boston. It was intended to be a guide for students who were preparing for the ministry. Its scope is comprehensive, revealing in great detail Mather's conception of adequate preparation for the sacred office. Books and authors in profusion are mentioned, and the comments thereon disclose interesting likes and dislikes. Of the fondness of Mather for Erasmus and Newton the reader can have no doubt; Locke, however, he seems suspicious of; and Aristotle he dismisses as a "muddy-headed pagan." But neither Mather's spicy observations on various things nor his interesting

excursus on style (pp. 44-47) can measure the worth of the book. It is the broad sweep of the study he suggests that arouses interest. His recommendations traverse many fields: ranging from pulpit rhetoric to chronology, from logic to music, from mathematics to poetry. A candidate for the ministry should acquire deep learning in the languages, both ancient and modern; he should know history, sacred and profane; but especially should he be a master of Scripture. In a word, Mather prescribed as desirable preparation for the ministry a broadly liberal education. If he truly represented the mind of Puritan New England, the conclusion to be derived from a reading of his *Manuductio* is that the Puritan ideal of an educated ministry had not been lost by a century of contact with the American wilderness.

But Mather in this work went beyond the mere giving of advice as to what a student of the ministry should read. From a course of preparation he would lead him into the pulpit and instruct him as to his pastoral duties. Into a discussion of the rules of conduct he laid down for the young minister the reviewer can not enter. It is interesting to observe, however, that he prescribed several rules of health, thereby anticipating a subject that a century later was giving concern to Elias Cornelius and others who were then promoting ministerial study. He also recommended a few rules of prudence, the fruit of a lifetime of experience, some of which, as Mather himself confessed, he had bought at a great cost. The wisdom of maturity at last guided his pen. By this time he had learned that arrogance and conceit profit one little. He had also learned the futility of trying to make straight the things that nature had intended should be crooked. "It may not be amiss," he wrote near the end of this treatise, "for you to have *Two Heaps*. An *Heap* of UNINTELLIGIBLES; and an *Heap* of INCURABLES. Every now and then you will meet with something or other, that may pretty much distress your Thoughts; But the *shortest Way* with the Vexations will be, *To throw them into the Heap they belong to*, and be no more distress'd about them."

An accessible facsimile text of this rare eighteenth-century treatise, edited by two Mather scholars, Thomas J. Holmes and Kenneth B. Murdock, will be appreciated by every student of American colonial history. The present reproduction, as the editors state in a bibliographical note, is apparently "the first accurate and complete republication of the fullest version of the *Manuductio* as it appeared in 1726."

Bucknell University.

J. Orin Oliphant.

JOHN WESLEY IN THE EVOLUTION OF PROTESTANTISM

By MAXIMIN PIETTE. New York: Sheed & Ward, 1937. 569 pages. \$5.00.

The first question which came to my mind when I learned, several years ago, that Father Piette was at work on a study of John Wesley, was, why should a Franciscan friar be interested in the great Methodist saint? Has Wesley and his "reaction," as the author terms the Wesleyan revival, simply intrigued Father Piette as a research project of great interest, or has he undertaken his elaborate research because he thinks Wesley's in-

fluence has a general religious significance, a significance which even Roman Catholics must recognize?

It has, undoubtedly, been the habit of writers on the Wesleyan revival to treat it as a more or less isolated movement, springing exclusively out of the soil of eighteenth century England, with little or no connection with the currents which were set in motion by the Reformation. Methodist writers, either because of their lack of scholarly understanding or their narrow denominationalism, have been, of course, the chief offenders in this regard. But it must be remembered that impartial historical scholarship is of very recent origin, and the last place where it might be expected to manifest itself would be in the field of denominational history. Church history is still largely written from the patriotic viewpoint, whether Catholic or Protestant, and a book breathing a spirit of impartiality, as does Father Piette's, is so rare as to cause an unusual amount of comment in both Catholic and Protestant circles. The Catholic bishop of Oklahoma, who writes a graceful introduction, says that in Father Piette's dealing with Wesley his "charity never fails and, better still never shows the slightest sign of having been forced." But as a historian, I would like to think that it is not charity—that is the willingness to overlook faults and frailties—which has produced such an admirable study, but rather the historian's sense of fairness and his desire to tell the whole truth and nothing but the truth. Anyhow, whether produced as a result of charity or the author's historical mindedness, Dr. Piette's study of John Wesley is, in my opinion, the fairest and most impartial study of a Protestant movement which has ever been produced by a Catholic scholar, at least as far as I am able to judge.

Begun as a doctor's dissertation at the University of Louvain, and published under the title *Reaction de John Wesley dans l'Evolution du Protestantisme* in 1925, the French edition gained recognition among both European and American scholars. It is now put into readable English, with no doubt the hope that it will find a larger reading public. And such certainly it deserves. The roots of the study go back to the beginnings of the Reformation and in Book One the Lutheran, Zwinglian and Calvinistic "reactions" are passed in rapid review. Though approaching the work of the Reformers from the usual Catholic viewpoint there is a welcome absence of vitriolic denunciation, which is all too common in Roman Catholic writers of the Reformation. Book Two deals with Protestantism in the eighteenth century and dwells upon the religious and moral bankruptcy of all the Protestant bodies in England. "John Wesley's Movement," the title of Book Three, covers somewhat more than half the volume and begins with an excellent survey of Wesley bibliography, more abundant, by the way, than for any other man in eighteenth century England. Unfortunately, doubtless due to careless copyists, there are far too many mistakes in the lengthy bibliography, such as wrong initials and misspelled names of authors, particularly.

The author, a son of St. Francis, naturally places great emphasis upon the developing spiritual life of John Wesley, and stresses the fact that the piety of the Methodist saint was based upon the treasures of Catholic spirituality, such as Thomas à Kempis' *Imitation*. He calls attention to his love of ritual; his acceptance of the real presence in the sacrament; the

influence of his mother, who was a strong Jacobite and High Church in her views; of his constant appeal to the primitive church and the Fathers of the first centuries. He records with satisfaction Wesley's break with the Moravians and his rejection of their Lutheran pietism; and finally his rejection and open break with Calvinism and all its works. Wesley's movement was, therefore, no heir to the sects which took their inspiration from Calvinism, but clung to the doctrine, the discipline, and the liturgical framework of the Anglican church. All this is in direct contradiction to the conclusions of Professor George C. Cell in his recent book *The Rediscovery of John Wesley* (New York, 1935), in which he attempts to place Wesley directly in the Lutheran and Calvinistic tradition, and even professes to prove that John Wesley, to all intents and purposes, was himself a Calvinist. Dr. Piette, however, asserts that "to carve a statue of John Wesley to look like a disciple of Luther, or Calvin, or any revolutionary" would take more talent than even a Phidias possessed. In this, in my opinion, Father Piette is nearer correct than those recent Methodists who have made the absurd attempt to Calvinize John Wesley.

Catholic readers might ask, says Bishop Kelley in his Foreword, why the Catholic church in England did not produce an English Loyola or a St. Francis, to do for England what Wesley did. The answer, he thinks, is that English Catholicism was so weakened during William and Mary's reign by the persecution of Catholics that such a possibility was out of the question. But in John Wesley, with his Catholic piety and his rejection of "Luther's doctrine of faith without good works," and also of "Calvin's doctrine of despair," an agency was created which barely escaped being Catholic in its emphasis. This, while not as acceptable as a Catholic movement, was far better than anything that could have come out of a Lutheran and Calvinistic background. While not a statement of the author himself, yet I infer that it meets his approval, and seems to be a fair summary of the conclusions which may be drawn from Father Piette's thorough and appreciative study.

The absence of an index is to be regretted.

The University of Chicago.

William W. Sweet.

SOME POLITICAL AND SOCIAL IDEAS OF ENGLISH DISSENT, 1763-1800

By ANTHONY LINCOLN. Cambridge: at the University Press; New York: The Macmillan Company, 1938. 292 pages. \$2.50.

The great fascination about the eighteenth century for the historian of idealism is that during that period the progressive wing of the movement exchanges its framework of supernaturalism for a more mundane one. As the effect of the scientific discoveries of Newton and his contemporaries gradually penetrate the theological world, old concepts give way to new. Natural law supplants the law of the gospel. Absolute standards of right and wrong yield to the nicely calculated less and more of utilitarianism. The emphasis on freedom of conscience shades imperceptibly into an enthusiasm for ceaseless intellectual investigation.

Mr. Lincoln, who won the Prince Consort prize at Cambridge with this essay in 1934, has taken his stand in the generation when the transition was at its most interesting stage and has considered this intriguing development in five topical chapters. Two deal with the political aspects of the Dissenting movement, one devoted to a general description of the "interest" or party, and another specifically to the struggle over the repeal of the Test Act. A third treats of the educational activities of the group, and the others discuss the political theories of two party leaders of the period, Richard Price and Joseph Priestly. Naturally, there is a certain amount of repetition, and the chronological element is not always kept clearly in mind. It may also be regretted that the work has not been revised in the light of studies appearing since its original composition, such as Olive Griffiths' analysis of English Presbyterian thought in the period (*Religion and Learning*, Cambridge, 1935). But there is nonetheless a deal of useful material here for the religious and intellectual historian of the period.

One striking point is several times alluded to but nowhere thoroughly discussed, and that is the failure of the Dissenters to win and hold any measure of popular support. At a time when the Wesleys were remaking the ecclesiastical and social map of England, the Presbyterians, Independents, and Baptists held themselves rigidly aloof from such Methodist enthusiasm. The result was that the efforts of the Dissenters to extend the bounds of tolerance resulted only in such displays of mob hostility as the Birmingham riots, and the success of the cause of reform had to wait on the day when Evangelicalism became respectable. Idealists of a later day would do well to read, learn, mark, and inwardly digest this history.

The University of Chicago.

M. M. Knappen.

ONE HUNDRED YEARS OF WELSH CALVINISTIC METHODISM IN AMERICA

By DANIEL JENKINS WILLIAMS. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1937. xxii, 448 pages. \$2.50.

The growing realization of the need for a new evaluation of the part that the Protestant denominations played in the life of the United States has resulted in the publication of works portraying, in an impressive manner, the part that certain branches of the Christian church have exerted in the molding of American civilization. This volume under review takes its place with the other monographs as a distinct and indispensable contribution to the history of the Christian church in the United States.

As the title indicates, it is a study devoted to the Welsh, especially to those who settled in the United States during the closing years of the eighteenth century and throughout the nineteenth century. The "Methodist" part of the name, as the author reveals, had its roots in the Oxford Movement of 1729, whereas the "Calvinistic" part "is derived from the complexion lent to its theology through the influence of the great Whitefield when he parted with the Arminian tendencies of Wesley and embraced the system of theology known as Calvinism." And for no special reason the

name continued to be applied to the denomination after its establishment in the United States in the face of some attempts to change it.

Almost one-half of the book is devoted to a detailed account of the growth and spread of the Calvinistic Methodist Church through local societies, presbyteries, and *gymanvas* (corresponding to the synod in the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America) from the founding of the church at Penycerau, Remsen Township, Oneida County, New York, in 1826, to the union with the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America in 1920. In this section there is a wealth of information on the local churches within the respective presbyteries which were included within certain *gymanvas*. With the rapid expansion of local establishments and presbyteries, *gymanvas* were set up largely along state lines, as in the case of New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Wisconsin, and Minnesota. For the churches to the westward, there was the *Gymanva* of the West. Finally, there was the General Assembly of the Calvinistic Methodist Church which was neither a legislative body nor a court of appeals, but could recommend measures to the *gymanvas*.

One of the most significant and interesting aspects of this work, from the view of the reviewer, is embodied in the chapter dealing with the fellowship meeting (*seiat*) and the prayer meeting. According to the author, it is in the fellowship meeting that "the genius of Calvinistic Methodism" is to be found. The significance of the *seiat* is to be found in the fact that it was a "miniature democracy," consisting of all communicant members of the church with their children. The power of this body resided in the elders and other communicant members, and not in the minister who was the spokesman and not the ruler of the *seiat*. The elders conducted the meeting by designating who should lead in the singing of hymns, in the reading of Scripture, and in prayer. The adults took part in the meeting by giving their testimonies; and the children, by repeating verses from the Bible. Members were received, dismissed, and disciplined by the *seiat*. In the prayer meeting, more formal than the fellowship meeting, singing, Scripture reading, and prayer formed the basis of the service. The author then proceeds to a consideration of the important rôle that the ministry played in the Calvinistic Methodist Church, and points out the difficulty experienced in the transition from the itinerant minister to the settled pastor and the resistance offered by the people to such a change.

The organized phases of the Calvinistic Methodist Church, in addition to safeguarding the doctrine of the church and maintaining church discipline, directed its activities to the securing of an educated ministry by encouraging the young men to obtain a college and seminary education by means of grants, to providing a "benefit fund for aged ministers," to promoting official publications, such as *The Friend*, and to the maintenance of home and foreign missionary endeavor. The author concludes the body of this comprehensive work with a chapter on the significant part that the subject of union played in the councils of the Calvinistic Methodist Church, to culminate in union with the Presbyterian Church of the United States of America in 1920 "in the wider interests of the Kingdom of God."

From the amount of information made available in this interesting study it is apparent that much time and effort have been put into its prep-

aration. And the product of this labor is a distinct contribution to church history. The value of this volume with its detailed information would have been greatly enhanced to the genealogist, librarian, and historian by the inclusion of an index.

Department of History,
Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A.

Guy S. Klett.

INDIANA ASBURY-DEPAUW UNIVERSITY, 1837-1937

By WILLIAM WARREN SWEET. New York: The Abingdon Press, 1937.
298 pages. \$2.50.

The sub-title suggests a wider field of investigation than the mere history of a mid-western college. It bears out its claim of being "a hundred years of higher education in the Middle West." The book portrays a cross section of the social life of the period, revealing customs, habits, mental climates, social patterns, and religious developments as affected by frontier conditions, the Civil War tensions, the reconstruction period, the "gilded age," and the present era.

Denominational colleges, we are told, were greatly aided by the decision of the Supreme Court in the famous Dartmouth College case which permitted the establishment of these schools independently of state control. Churches then vied with each other in creating colleges, many of them at first as stable as the proverbial mushroom. Their primary goal was that of training ministers, but gradually the objectives were enlarged to include the training of youth for various fields of service. In the early period the Presbyterians and Congregationalists surpassed the Methodists and the Baptists in the building of colleges. The latter, indeed, were quite sceptical of their value. Not until the third decade of the nineteenth century did the Methodists seriously undertake the task. Indiana-Asbury, founded in 1837, was the sixth Methodist college in point of age.

The hardships encountered during the early days are graphically pictured. We see Matthew Simpson, future president of the college, walking ninety miles to begin his college course. As the first president of Indiana-Asbury, he received a salary of \$600, and *mirabile dictu*, was capable of offering courses in Latin, Greek, Hebrew, French, mathematics, natural science, philosophy, theology, and evidences of Christianity. The inaugural address of another early president was almost three hours long. Here we find the first medical school established in connection with any Methodist institution. At one time the night meetings of the students were abolished because of the "danger from fire." The strife and bitter feelings engendered finally led to the expulsion of the entire senior class of twenty-two members.

At first recreational activities were limited to riding, walking, and congenial social intercourse. Sports were considered dangerous to body, mind, and soul. Sabbatarian strictness would have satisfied the staunchest Puritan. Many students lived on fifty cents a week for food. Prices, however, were not in accordance with the 1926 level. Eggs, for instance, were 3 cents a dozen, butter 6 cents a pound, chickens 8 cents a piece, and if

the student perchance was guilty of "fowl play"—nothing. This thriving college was one of the first to adopt voluntary chapel attendance, and was among the first to follow Charles Eliot in his drastic educational reform movement. In 1884 the present name "DePauw" was adopted.

The story is simply and lucidly told by the author. The work is well documented, profusely illustrated, and furnished with a valuable index.

Garrett Biblical Institute.

A. W. Nagler.

LECTURES ON THE RELIGIOUS THOUGHT OF SÖREN KIERKEGAARD.

By EDWARD GEISMAR. Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1937. xlix, 97 pages. \$2.00.

In 1936 the distinguished professor of theology at the University of Copenhagen, who a decade earlier had published a very thorough-going study of Kierkegaard's life and thought, summarized his findings in five brief lectures delivered upon the Stone Foundation at Princeton Theological Seminary. As the trunk and branches of a tree are revealed in exact contour in midwinter, so what was what in Kierkegaard is clearly presented in this outline. A fine apology for the conclusions of the melancholy Dane may be read in the introduction written by the professor of philosophy in the University of Minnesota, David Swenson.

The life and theology of Kierkegaard are accounted for by the influence of a maladjusted father and a broken engagement with Regine Olsen, whose classical description beginning on page 27 should not be missed by anyone aesthetically inclined.

Only the absolute dwelt in the brooding soul of Kierkegaard. Hence, he was always vehemently protesting against the divorce between life and thought and holding in contempt the philosopher who builds a beautiful castle of thought and thereupon dwells "in a dog-kennel at its side" (p. 25). Therefore he announced but one thesis, *the Christianity of the New Testament does not now exist* and could attack without mercy both Bishop Mynster and Professor Martensen.

Kierkegaard's verdict upon the church was that a "Church at peace with the world falsifies Christianity in a double manner. It overlooks the inner suffering inseparable from the discipline of the inner religious life; and it also overlooks the outer suffering inseparable from Christian conduct in an imperfect world" (p. 13). His polemic against the clergy as "cannibals and that too of the most contemptible sort," our lecturer refuses to support and likewise finds some of Kierkegaard's comments on sex revolting and his discrediting of family life abnormal (pp. 87-92).

The essence of Christianity, according to Kierkegaard, is an "absolute commitment to the highest end, an essential acceptance of the discipline of suffering, and an interpenetration of the consciousness with the sense of guilt" (p. 49).

Professor Geismar refuses to equate Kierkegaard with Karl Barth, since the former holds that "the individual realizes a true God-relation-

ship in spite of his imperfection and guilt," while the latter cuts all bonds connecting man with the *Wholly-Other* (pp. 52, 59).

The Colgate-Rochester Divinity School.

Conrad Henry Moehlman.

JOHN CARLISLE KILGO
PRESIDENT OF TRINITY COLLEGE, 1894-1910

By PAUL NEFF GARBER, Durham: Duke University Press, 1937. xi, 312 pages. \$3.00.

The professor of church history in Duke University has written a first-hand biography of the late President Kilgo of Trinity College, the foundation college of the present Duke University which celebrates its centennial in the academic year 1938-1939. This biography of a Southern educator is more than the serious "Centennial Publication" that it is, with extensive reference notes and full bibliography and index of eleven pages. It is the inspiring, romantic recital of the rise of an American who possessed courage, confidence, and convictions. John Carlisle Kilgo was without much of formal education. Always a persuasive and eloquent preacher of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, he possessed good sense and rare understanding of social problems and spent the closing years of his life (1910-1922) as a bishop of that church.

President Kilgo assumed office while the controversy between the denominational college and state higher education was progressing. His case for "Christian Education" was accepted by his denomination, of which Washington Duke and family, who had built up a fortune from tobacco, were members. When President Kilgo went to Trinity College, it had a debt of \$40,000, less than \$25,000 in endowment, and property valued at not more than \$200,000. "When he retired, it had the largest endowment of any Southern college, and had assets to the amount of one and a quarter million dollars." The Duke family became responsible for the location (1892) and development of Trinity College in Durham. Under Dr. Kilgo the college was known for its faculty, students, buildings, equipment, and standards.

It is significant that Trinity College stood for academic freedom. The test came when Dr. John Spencer Bassett, an alumnus and professor of history, discussed, in the October, 1903 issue of Trinity's *South Atlantic Quarterly*, the Negro problem from the point of view of a Southern scholar. His article, "Stirring up the Fires of Race Antipathy," contained the statement that "all in all" Booker T. Washington was "the greatest man, save General Lee, born in the South in a hundred years . . ." This was not meant to be a racial compliment, for, according to Dr. Bassett, Washington was "not a typical negro." The press generally took it otherwise, even after Dr. Bassett interpreted his statement. It was *Webster's* (Reidsville, N. C.) *Weekly* that said: "Our point is that Duke's money has made it possible for Trinity's teacher of history to fling defiance in the face of Southern ideals and call the young men of the South to forsake the faith of their fathers and worship at the shrine of a negro." Although Dr. Bassett's resignation was demanded by the press, Benjamin N. Duke

was repeatedly urged by Walter Hines Page, editor of *World's Work*, "not to allow the Board of Trustees to accept" it. After gently spanking the professor with "regret that Professor Bassett has expressed certain opinions which give offence to many" (p. 276) and with the satisfying statement "that Prof. Bassett does not believe in nor does he teach social equality . . ." (p. 279), the Board of Trustees refused to accept the resignation.

The author sees no point in adding that in 1906 Dr. Bassett was happily located at Smith College, but it might be a part of a movement of Southern scholars to the North. At each general conference, beginning with that of 1898, Dr. Kilgo ran for the bishopric of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South. When he was successful, in 1910, Dr. Kilgo declared: "I have always loved the Methodist Church, and never wanted to be anything but a Methodist preacher."

President Kilgo and Trinity College received the most pungent criticism for accepting Duke money. Many things were said except that the black laborer had been exploited in order to build the tobacco fortunes. Yet agitations of the race question were ended in North Carolina with the Bassett episode. To the *New Negro* Durham was the "Capital of the Black Middle Class." The Methodist Episcopal Church, South, has been among the pioneers in Southern race relations. Undoubtedly the Duke millions and Trinity College prior to 1911 have played their parts in this development.

Durham, North Carolina.

Miles Mark Fisher.

HORACE BUSHNELL AND RELIGIOUS EDUCATION

By A. J. WM. MYERS. Boston: Manthorne and Burack, 1937. 183 pages. \$2.00.

Liberal religious education in America is a century old, and it originated chiefly with Horace Bushnell. Although Bushnell himself renewed his religious life in the midst of one of Yale's revivals, neither then nor later did he believe that this was the normal method of propagating religion. As early as 1838 he startled a revival-ridden church by saying "religion has as deep an interest in the proper conduct of times of non-revival, as in these periods of glowing excitement." By 1844 he wrote an article on "The Kingdom of Heaven as a Grain of Mustard Seed," in which he advocated the positive principle of growth as the way in which the church might best fulfill its mission in the world. "It [the church] is a creature whose vitality is spiritual life, and it can have its increase only by the same law which pertains in all organic living bodies, i. e., by *development from within, not by external accretion*." In this he also advanced the idea that the family should serve as the mediating experience of God. "Let him [the parent] be there, as the gardener among his opening flowers, expecting their fragrance and beauty, not that they will all be thistles—expecting it, because God hath promised, and the dews of his grace are perpetually felt." As early as 1847 Bushnell had developed a well-rounded doctrine of

Christian Nurture, which he set forth in two discourses published by the Massachusetts Sabbath School Society.

For a short while it appeared as though Bushnell's revolutionary ideas would gain general currency without controversy. But Dr. Bennet Tyler, a stalwart champion of revivals, issued a pamphlet against Bushnell's views. This opened a controversy that was to last for several years. Hardly had the issue of Bushnell's radicalism been raised when his publishers withdrew the *Discourses* from the public. Within the same year, however, Bushnell issued them through another publisher in greatly enlarged form. The book sold widely, and the controversy raged. Various devices were employed to bring Bushnell to trial for heresy, but, owing to the loosely organized system of Congregationalism, every scheme failed. But the debate continued. Finally, Bushnell's own church withdrew from the Hartford Association in the hope of restoring peace.

Professor Myers has treated this early period of Bushnell's career more fully than has any writer since that controversial era. He not only restores the historical setting of Bushnell's early thought, but also shows how its main features have dominated the educational theory of the liberal church since his time. If this book could have been made available at the beginning of the twentieth century, it would have been especially helpful to religious liberals who experienced no little difficulty in their effort to introduce the theory of Christian nurture into the thought and practice of the American churches.

Duke University.

H. Shelton Smith.

CHARLES KINGSLEY, 1819-1875

By MARGARET THORP. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1937. vii, 212 pages. \$3.00.

This biography of Kingsley is based on careful study of a large number of letters and documents hitherto unused, and is provided with a useful bibliography of Kingsley's works. It is full of interesting anecdotes which reveal the character of the man, *e. g.*, his passion for the scenery of Devon, his unconventionality, etc. It shows him as conducting himself rather better than it is generally believed that he did in the famous Newman controversy. Into the wider significance of the many movements of thought with which Kingsley was connected, Mrs. Thorp does not however enter.

New York City.

T. S. K. Scott-Craig.